

1/1-

20

48

48

65

78

81-

8766

92

100

109

114

123

130

137

Library of the Theological Seminary.

PRINCETON, N. J.

Collection of Puritan Literature.

Division

SCC

Section

9050

Number

part 1



An *Mss.*

AN
ANSVVERE TO A CER-
TAINE TREATISE OF THE
CROSSE IN BAPTISME.

Intituled

A Short Treatise of the Crosse in Baptisme, con-
tracted into this Syllogisme.

*No humane ordinance becomming an Idoll may law-
fully be vsed in the service of God.*

*But the signe of the Crosse, being an humane ordinance
is become an Idoll. Ergo:*

*The signe of the Crosse, may not lawfully bee vsed in the
service of God.*

VVherein not only the weaknesse of the Syllogisme it
selfe, but also of the grounds and proofes there-
of, are plainly discovered.

Hutton
By L. H. Doct. of Divinitie.

August. Serm. 19. de Sanctis.

*Crucifixus noster à morte resurrexit, & celos ascendit: Crucem nobis
in memoriam suæ passionis reliquit.*

Idem Serm. 130. De Tempore.

Crua Christi, est clavis paradisi, & insigne regnû.



Printed at Oxford by Ioseph Barnes, and are to be
sold in Paules Church-yard at the signe of the
Crowne, by *Simon Waterfen*, 1605.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2011 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

<http://www.archive.org/details/answeretocertain00hutt>

TO THE RIGHT HONORABLE
AND MOST REVEREND FA-
ther in God, RICHARD, *by the providence of*
God, Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of
all England & Metropolitane; & one of his Maie-
ties most Honorable Privie Councell.

Nothing makes mee more a
fraid, to offer this mine an-
swere, to your *Graces* view &
censure, then the very length,
which cōtrary to my purpose
and conceit, it is now growne
vnto. For both it may iustly argue me of indif-
cretion, for framing so long an answer to so
short a Treatise: and the longer it is, the more
must it needs be subiect to diuers and sundry
oversights. Both which give me iust occasion
much the rather to flie to so safe a sanctuary, as
your *Graces* patronage, not only against them,
who for the matters sake will certainly mislike
it: but euen against them also, who fauoring the
argument, may peraduēture iudge the coat too
big for the body, or wish somthing otherwise
then here they find it. May it please your *Grace*
therfore to remember, that first this matter of

The Epistle Dedicatory.

the *Crosse in Baptisme*, is that great stumbling block, whereat al our discontented brethren doe take offence; & secondly, that in this small Treatise al the chiefeſt arguments which they vsually make againſt this ſigne, are comprehended: I make no doubt, but that both your *Grace* & al other indifferent Readers, will eaſily pardon my length. Eſpecially becauſe my endeavour was, to giue iuſt ſatiſfaction to euery obiection, and to leaue nothing vnanswered, that might ſeeme to carry any waight of reaſon with it. which courſe, as I held throughout the whole Treatiſe in generall, ſo more eſpecially in the laſt part. Where our obiections, which the Treatiſer maketh ſhew to ſatiſſie, are iuſtified to be too waighty, for ſo flight and incoherent answers, as are fitted vnto them. The Treatiſer more ouer, not only ſomewhat in euery part of the Treatiſe, but fully and of reſolved & ſetled purpoſe in the laſt part, maketh great vaunt; that either the Ancient fathers in their times vſed not this ſigne at al in Baptiſme, or if they did, they vſed it to far other purpoſes thē we do now; or laſtly, if they vſed it to any ſuch end yet euen in them it was neuer free from ſinne,
and

The Epistle Dedicatory.

and superstition. I thought it therefore a principall part of my duty, somewhat more at large to insist vpon these points, being things in my iudgment not slightly to be passed ouer. And accordingly haue declared, both that the Ancient fathers vsed this consignation of the Crosse in Baptisme in their times, And also that they vsed it, (though to other purposes too) yet even to such ends & purposes, as our Church doth at this day: & lastly, I haue freed (as I trust) aswell our Christian vse thereof, from suspicion of Idolatry, as that vse which the Auncients had of it, from that imputation of sin & superstition, which vniustly is supposed to haue accompanied it in their times. And this I trust may be sufficient excuse and defense for the prolixity of this answer: As for the ouersights and imperfections therein contained, no iust Apology can be made: only I must fly to your *Graces* fauour, & good acceptance of the Readers. I could haue wished, and from my hart I doe desire, that the late Cōference before his most excellent Maiestie, (so much desired & expected before it came) might haue had that successe wherof there was hope giuen at the first. That

The Epistle Dedicatory.

is either vtterly haue taken away, and made an end of these quarels in our Church, or at the least, after full satisfaction giuen, (which there they had) somewhat abated the heat of their discontentment. That so we all with one hart and one minde, might haue provided ourselues against that head of Popery, that by these domesticall dissentions getteth dayly strength among vs. But it is come to passe (I knowe not how) that these contētions are since that time, much more rife then they were before, & prosecuted with greater heate thē ever; As though by that meeting in the conference, they had rather taken hart, and greater courage, then any soile; and new strength rather, then any iust reprove, or satisfaction. Where vppon, as diuers others haue endeououred to answer their exceptions to our Church Ceremonies in generall, so I haue laboured to take out of the way all their scrupels and obiections against this particular of the Crosse in Baptisme. wherein my conscience beareth me record, I haue walked with an vpright hart, and sincere affection; and I verily thinck, according to the truth in this behalfe. If therefore there shall be any
thing

The Epistle Dedicatory

thing found therein, answerable to the worth & dignity of the cause; all that iustly and properly belongeth only to your *Grace*, from whom it tooke the first beginning. If otherwise, I shalbe alwaies ready vpon better information, to reforme my errors and ouersight. How soeuer I commend both it and my selfe to your *Graces* honorable fauour and protection, and shalbe alwaies willing to dispose my labours according to your *Graces* directiō; studying in althings wherein God shal enableme, to aduāce the glory of God, and knowledge of his truth. wherof as God hath made your *Grace* the greatest ornament and pillar in our Church; so I humbly beseech him of his infinite goodnes, to blesse all your religious & careful endeouours for the same; And withal, to giue you many honorable daies and comfortable Assistants in so great a worke; to the glory of his holy name, contentment of his most excellent Maiestie, & perpetuall good of this Church and congregation.

*Your Graces most bounden
and dutifull Chapleine*

LEON. HUTTEN.

I have been thinking of you very much lately, and
 wondering how you are getting on. I hope you
 are well and happy. I have been very busy
 lately, but I have managed to find some time
 to write to you. I have been thinking of you
 very much lately, and wondering how you are
 getting on. I hope you are well and happy. I
 have been very busy lately, but I have managed
 to find some time to write to you. I have been
 thinking of you very much lately, and wondering
 how you are getting on. I hope you are well and
 happy. I have been very busy lately, but I have
 managed to find some time to write to you. I
 have been thinking of you very much lately, and
 wondering how you are getting on. I hope you
 are well and happy. I have been very busy lately,
 but I have managed to find some time to write
 to you. I have been thinking of you very much
 lately, and wondering how you are getting on. I
 hope you are well and happy. I have been very
 busy lately, but I have managed to find some
 time to write to you. I have been thinking of
 you very much lately, and wondering how you
 are getting on. I hope you are well and happy.

James Earl Ray
born 1928, London, England

1944. 11. 11.



AN ANSWERE TO A TREATISE of the Crosse in Baptisme.

The Title whereof is

**A Short Treatise of the Crosse in Baptisme
contracted into this Syllogisme.**

*No humane ordinance becomming an Idoll, may lawfullie
be vsed in the service of God.*

*But the signe of the crosse being a humane ordinance, is be-
come an Idoll. Ergo*

*The signe of the Crosse may not lawfully be vsed in the ser-
vice of God.*

*This short treatise of the Crosse in Baptisme
consisteth of three principall parts.*

- 1 The maine syllogisme whereinto this whole treatise is contracted.
- 2 The prooffe of the severall partes of this syllogisme.
- 3 The answering of certaine obiections.

THE ANSWERE TO THE WHOLE SYLLOGISME.

*Concerning the maine syllogisme, let vs consider, first a
little of the forme, and then afterwarde come vnto the
matter.*

A

IN



N the forme I only obserue, that if the Treatiser had gone ordinarily to worke, and kept himselfe exactly to the termes of his *Maïor*, the *Minor* would much better, and with lesse suspicion of deceit haue beene conceaved thus:

No humane ordinance becomming an Idoll, may lawfullie be vsed in the service of God.

But the signe of the Crosse is a humane ordinance becomming an Idoll. Ergo

The signe of the Crosse may not lawfully be vsed in the service of God.

For so the ambiguity of the word, *becoming* would haue still remained, and we might still haue beene at our choice whether we would take it for *be seeming*, and adding ornament or decencie to an Idoll, or for *being made or become indeede an Idoll it selfe*. And I marvaile much why the Treatiser held not this course, considering that, *first* it would haue been as available for his present purpose, and *secondly* it would stil haue left an impression in the minde of the readers, that no ornament, or other thing *be seeming* or *adding decencie* to an Idoll (and they can make what the list an Idoll) may lawfully be vsed in Gods service. By which meanes as great a blow would haue beene giuen to *Caps, Surplisses, Hoodes, and Copes*, as now by this Treatiser is giuen to the signe of the Crosse.

But the Treatiser (you will say) meant more honestly, and therefore having vsed a word of doubtful signification in the *maïor*, he very sincerely restrained it in the *minor* to his purposed intent, thereby shewing that he dealt plainly, & intended no deceit. His sinceritie and true
dea-

dealing is no waies teſtified by this meanes: for had he indeede meant plainly, and intended no Sophiſtication, hee woulde haue conceaved his ſyllogiſme in vſuall, and knowne termes, & ſuch as are proper and familiar in this argument of ceremonies, as namely inſteede of *humane ordinance* he woulde haue vſed *Eccleſiaſtical conſtitution*, for *becomming an Idoll*, he woulde haue ſaid, *abused to Idolatrie*, or *ſuperſtitiously abused*, in place of *ſervice of God*, hee woulde haue put *celebrating of Gods ſervice*, and ſo haue concluded in this, or ſome ſuch like forme.

No Eccleſiaſticall conſtitution, that ſometime hath benee ſuperſtitiously abused, may after wards be reduced to his firſt lawfull uſe, and ſo retained in the celebrating of Gods ſervice.

But the ſigne of the Croſſe in Baptiſme, is an Eccleſiaſticall conſtitution, that hath ſometime benee ſuperſtitiouslie abused. Ergo

The ſigne of the Croſſe in Baptiſme may not bee reduced to his firſt lawfull uſe, and ſo retained in the celebrating of Gods ſervice.

This obſervation I make the rather becauſe the very name of *humane ordināce* is alwaies odious, & importeth traditions meerely humane, wicked, impious, and lying, proceeding frō our corrupt nature: for the which cauſe humane doctrines, the commandements of men, are re- proved by our Saviour: contrarywiſe the name of *Eccleſiaſticall conſtitutions*, is much more gentle, & gracious, and importeth ordinances made by the Church of Chriſt, which the very name affordeth to be not meerly humane, and therefore not falſe, but in part diuine, and therefore good, true, holy, and ſuch as pleaſe God. The reaſon is. The Church is ruled by the ſpirit of Chriſt, who is the

truth, and therefore the traditions of the Church are true and holy. And yet it pleased the Treatiser, in his charity, rather to use *humane ordinance*, then *Ecclesiasticall constitution*, to what purpose and intent let the indifferent Reader iudge.

But because he was to make choice of his termes by his owne iudgment, and not by my direction, I wil therefore follow him in his owne words. And then I say again, that if he had indeede meant honestly, and intended no sophistickiō, he would in such propositions, as expresse a thing to be iust or vniust, lawful, or vnlawful, haue set downe the circumstances of time, persons, and place, or such other like. Of time in this sort.

No humane ordinance, once of good vse, that afterwarde became an Idoll, may lawfully be used in the service of God.

But the signe of the Crosse being a humane ordinance, once of good vse, after ward became an Idoll. Ergo

The signe of the Crosse may not lawfully be used in the service of God.

Of place, and persons thus.

No humane ordinance becoming an Idoll in the Church of Rome, and amonge the Papists, may lawfully be used in the service of god in the Church of Englande, and amonge the Protestants.

But the signe of the Crosse is a humane ordinance becoming an Idoll in the Church of Rome, and amonge the Papists, Ergo.

The signe of the Crosse may not lawfully be used in the seruice of God in the Church of England, and amonge the Protestants.

For thus the fallhood and inconsequence of his argument

gumert would easily haue appeared vnto all men. But the Treatiser thought it more for his aduantage, to muddie his propositions, concealing all circumstances that might giue light to the point in controuersie, and to let down his argument confusedly, the more to stuble the vnskilfull Reader. But leauing the forme of this syllogisme, let vs briefly come to the matter therein contained.

The Maior.

No humane ordinance becomming an Idol, may lawfully be vsed in the seruice of god.

The answer to the maior.

The *maior* is merely false, for although the Syllogizer doth verily perswade himselfe, that he hath cunningly contriued into on proposition, two inexpugnable reasons, why the signe of the Crosse may not lawfully be vsed in the seruice of god, the first because it is a humane ordinance, the second because it is become an Idol, yet there is no truth neither in the one; nor in the other.

Concerning the first, that no humane ordinance is to be vsed in the seruice of god; I would faine knowe of the Treatiser what he meaneth *by the seruice of god*. If he meane (*preaching*, which to that sect is now become almost the only seruice of god) I will propose such plaine matter against his assertion; as himselfe shal not be able to contradict. The sentences which *S^t. Paul* borrowed out of heathen Poets, *Aratus*. Acts 17.28. *Menander*, 1. Cor. 15.33. *Epimenides*; *Titus*. 1. 12; were first of humane inuention: for so the Apostle expressly citeth two of them in there severall places. Secondly they were vsed in the seruice of god: For the *first* was vsed in a sermon to the Athenians; the *second* in that great argu-

ment & heauenly discourse of our resurrection: the *third* in his instruction to *Titus* how he should carrie him selfe towards them of Creet. And lastly, for anie thing that euer I could learne, they were well and lawfully vsed in gods seruice. For though it haue pleased those that are of opinion with our treatiser, in the humor of there sect, and fauor of there ignoranc, viterly to reiect the vse of all humane learning in their sermons, yet I hold it not therefore vnlawfull: And sure I am that, *Ambrosius delectandi gratiâ utitur sententiarum argu- ijs: Hieronymus poetarum illecebris, et Mimorum salibus: Tertullianus facetijs et iocis: Chrysostomus similibus, collationibus, et metaphoris ad illustrationem et delectationem admirabili artificio continnatis*, as a learned man speaketh of those fathers.

And Saint *Augustine*, a greater clarke then any they can set against him, is of opinion that ^a *Si qua forte vera,* ^a *De doctr. christi- an. lib. 2. c. 4.* *Et fidei nostra accommoda dixerunt, non solum formidanda non sunt, sed ab ijs etiam tanquâ iniustis possessoribus, in vsum nostrum vendicanda:* now if a man vpon these grounds should inferre, that therefore all humane ordinances & inventions are not excluded from the service of God, I marvaile what our Treatiser would thinke of his vniversal negatiue proposition.

Secondly, if by the *service of God* he vnderstande the *Leiturgie* and forme of diuine seruice and praier, then I demaunde what manner of *Leiturgie* there was in the Church of the Jewes till the time of our Saviour. For wee are not to imagine, that in their dayly sacrifices, in their Sabbaths, and new moones, & other festival daies, men assembled only to performe the bare outward actions of killing their sacrifices, and offering their oblations, with-

without any forme of praier and Leiturgie for such holy purposes. And yet those outward actions only are recorded and registred vnto vs, as being of Gods institution, and those other of praier, and thanksgiving, & vocall service of the congregation (if any such were, as certainly they were) are passed over in silence without any record or remembrance; which makes me to conceaue (and verily I shal remaine in that opinion til I be reformed) that al other complements were wholly left, & permitted to the direction of the Priests. For had there been any such formes of praier and thankgiuing instituted by God, they would (noe doubt) ether haue beene recorded by Moses, as well as there forme of blessing the people, mentioned Numb: 6. 24. or preserued as safe as the other Ceremonies and rites of there sacrifices. And herein I am the rather confirmed by the Titles and Inscriptions of diuers psalmes, which in the times of those oblations & sacrifices were vsed in holy meetings. But the whole manner of ordering and disposing of them seemeth to haue beene in the Priests and Leuites, and them that had the chiefe gouernment in holy assemblies. For so much both the sending of diuers psalmes to the Chaunter, or him, that excelled in musicke as *Ieduthune*, *Asaph*, the sonn of *Corah*: and the names of cerraine Instruments, or tunes whereto they were to be set, as *Neginoth*, *Shoshannim*, *Alamoth*, and such like, doe most manifestly import. Also I would faine know of the Treasurer whether the appointing of the Singers, Priests, and Levites in their orders and courses, which is ascribed to *Dauid*, 1. *Chron.* 25. to *Ichoida*, 2. *Chro.* 23. 18. to *Ezechias*, 2. *chron.* 31. 2. were a humane ordinance, or noe? for that it was vsed in Gods service, these alledged places

sufficiently testifie: and that it was a humane ordinance instituted first by *David*, and renewed afterward by those others; these places following plainly affirme. The long of the Lord began with the trumpets & instruments of *David* King of Israel. 2. *Chron*: 29. 27. *Ezechias* the King and Princes commaunded the *Levites*, to praise the Lord with the words of *David*, and *Asaph* the kings seer. 2. *Chron*. 29. 30. and after the captivitie, *Ioshua* the Priest, and *Zerubbabell* the governour, appointed the Priests in their apparel with trumpets, & the *Levites* the sonnes of *Asaph* with Cymbals, to praise the Lord after the ordinance of *David* King of Israel. *Efra*: 3. 10.

Thirdly if by the *service of God*, he meane the *outward ceremonies* of our religious carriage, and behavior while we are in the Church hearing Gods word, and praying vnto him in the congregation, I woulde knowe whether those ordinances which the Apostle *S. Paul* prescribeth That women should keepe silence in the Church 1. *Cor*. 14. 34. That men should pray bare headed and women couered. 1. *Cor*. 11. 4. That men comming rogitier to the Lords supper should stay one for another, and that prophane feasting should not be mingled with the Lodes Supper. 1. *Corinth*. 11. 17. whether I saie these, and many such like were of humane institution or diuine? If they were of mans ordināce, then the Treatise is much mistaken, for al these belonged to the service of God, if they were not of humane but diuine institution, how then doth he cal them *My things*, *The ordinances that I haue deliuered*? 1. *Cor*. 11. 2. and why speakes he not in Gods person, but his owne? *I will* that men pray euery where lifting vp pure hands. That women array themselves in comely apparel. 1. *Tim*: 2. 8. 9. and, *I permit* not
a wo-

a woman to teach. *1. Tim: 2. 12.* If the Treatiser shal lay that in al these examples formerly alleadged, those men were ledde by the spirit of God, & therefore what soeuer they appointed was Gods ordinance, my answer there vnto is, that now also the Church of God is guided by the same spirit: and as now, so even then also, there was a difference to be made betweene those things which God commanded in such actions, & those things which were ordered by men: else the scripture would neither so expressly haue mentioned such things to haue bin done by such men, as in the former examples: nor S^r. Paule haue spoken in his own person soe resolutely, as in the latter. A manifest prooffe wherof we may drawe out of the same Apostle speaking of a matter of greater importāce, namely marriage, *1. Cor: 7.* where he would not haue acknowledged, that some thing he spake by *permission*, and some other things by *Commandement*, as in the 6. verse, nor haue so exactly distinguished between the *Lord commandeth* & not *I*, speaking of equal marriages, verse. 10. and *I commande*, and not *the Lord*, speaking of vnequal marriages, verse. 12. But onely to giue vs to vnderstand, that in these matters of ceremony and outward order, where he vseth not Gods expresse authoritie, there he speaketh of his owne iudgment, directed alwaies, as him selfe veryly thinketh. *1. Cor. 7. 40.* by the spirit of God.

Hitherto I haue spoken only of those things, wherein I wold willingly be instructed, concerning the Leiturgies of the old testamēt til the apostles times. Now, if I should resume the same points, & discourse of them, as I finde them to haue been vsed in the Primitiue Church & immediate ages next after the apostles, I should presse the

Tertull. in A-
pol. cap. 46.

Aug. de doct.
christ. li. 2. c. 40.

Lactant. lib. 4.

Niceph. Cal.
lib. 8. cap. 29.

treatise with such a multitude of examples aboute al ex-
ception, as must needs ouerthrow his weake position.
For first for sermons, both in there preachings and in
there writings, how full of humane arts and secular lear-
ning are the auncient holy fathers? For although in the
end and scope of there learning, * *Quid adeo simile Philo-
sophus et Christianus? Gracia discipulus et calis? fama ne-
gotiator, et vitæ? &c* yet in the commerce and inter-
course of there knowledge, as on the one side, *Quis poe-
tarum? quis Sophistarum qui non omnino de Prophetarum
fonte potauerit? ut facile credatur diuinam literaturam,
thesaurum fuisse posteriori cuiq; sapientiæ:* so on the o-
ther side, * *Nonne aspicimus quanto auro et argento et
veste suffarcinatus exierit de Ægypto Cyprianus doctor
suauissimus, et Martyr beatissimus? quanto Lactantius,
quanto Victorinus, Optatus, Hylarius, and to omitt
there rest, quanto ipse qui hoc scribit Augustinus?* So that
in those times, * *Philosophia humana suis armis confecta
obmutuit.* and there was not anie one of the auncient fa-
thers, that was not able to conuince prophane Poets,
Sophiters, & Philosophers, out of their own principles
and superstitions, God in his wilddome soe giueing gifts
to those his most worthie instruments, that they, * *Tan-
quam periti Musici gratum et iucundum decantantes car-
mẽ, super vacaneas quoq; percurrere plectrockordas potu-
erint, et ornatus gratia supra eas quæ ex usu sunt, alias
etiam adijcere.*

Secondly for the Leiturgies & forme of diuine seruice
in those times, as we do willingly acknowledg, al things
to haue beene of far more simple and plain e obseruati-
on, then they came afterward vnto, so it cannot be deni-
ed, but that euen then also *humane ordinances* & inven-
tions,

tions were vsed in Gods seruice : for what else shal wee cal, and to what head shal we refer, the Leiturgies of S^c. *James* vsed in the Church of *Ierusalem*? of S^c. *Basill* vsed in the Church of *Casarea Cappad*? of S^c. *Chrysostome* vsed in the Church of *Constantinople*? of S^c. *Clement*, vsed in the Church of *Rome*? and generally of all those other famous Leiturgies mentioned in the Ecclesiastical histories, and recorded to haue been vsed in several Churches in the most flourishing state of the Primitiue Church? what conceipt shal we haue of those zealous & religious Christians, that haue in al ages, and in al Churches, without any interruption, so devoutly song, & said, *Cathanasius*, and the *Nicene* Creede? what of the heavenly dittie, *Te Deum*, compiled by S^c. *Augustine*, and S^c. *Ambrose*, and from them derived into al Churches? what of the sacred hymne *Trisagium*, vsed first in the Church of *Constantinople*, & afterward commended to the world by the council of *Calcedon*? what of so manie excellent hymnes, verses, *Antiphonies*, *Responsories*, *Rogations*, and *Letanies*, as we read to haue beene made by S. *Gregory Nazianzen*, S. *Hilarie*, S. *Ambrose*, S. *Augustine*, *Synesius*, *Prudentius*, *Gregorie* the great, *Sedulius*, and diuers others, vsed continually in the Church? And lastly, (to auide infinite examples to this purpose) what shal we thinke of the fourth Coūcel of *Toledo*, that doth iustifie the saying of praiers, & singing of hymnes made by men, against such as woulde haue nothing vsed in the church, but what is in the Canonical scriptures, or hath beene receiued by the Apostles? *Quia nonnulli hymni humano studio in laudem Dei, atq. Apostolorum, & Martyrum triumphos compositi esse noscuntur, sicut ij quos beatissimi Doctores Hylarius & Ambrosius condiderunt, quas ta-*

Conc. Toleta. 4.
Canon. 12.

De consec. dist.
1. ca. de hymnis.

men quidam specialiter reprobant, pro eo quod de scripturis sanctorum Canonum, vel Apostolica traditione non existunt; respuant ergo & illum hymnum ab hominibus compositum, quem in fine omnium Psalmorum dicimus, gloria & honor patri, & filio, & spiritui sancto, &c. Similiter & totum illud, quod sequitur post Angelicum hymnum, gloria in excelsis Deo, &c. quod tamen Ecclesiastici Doctores composuerunt, &c. I haue the more willingly repeated the most part of the Canon, because it so fitly meeteth with the thwart humor of certaine men of our time, who scoffingly and in contempt call those godly songs made by men (which are ioined in the same volume with our singing Psalmes) Ballads & Jigges and such like names, and can abide nothing but the *Geneua* Psalmes (as they call them) to be sung in our Christian congregations. As if they certainly were Gods word it selfe, & not rather expositions and paraphrases made by men.

Thirdly, for the rites and ceremonies of those times it must be remembred that first for a lōg space in the church, they were Iudaical, either because mē borne & brought vp in the Iewish Pædagogie, knewe not what belonged vnto Christian liberty, or else because many worthy and famous men in those daies were of opinion, that all the Iewish ceremonies, could not suddenly be abrogated, without the great offence & scādal of the weaker sort. Of which opinion it seemes S^r *Augustine* also was, who oftentimes praiseth and commendeth this saying, *Iudaicā Synagoga cum honore fuisse sepeliendam*. Secondly it is to be observed, that they were diuers & fundrie in diuers Churches, according to that saying of *Socrates*. *Omnes*

Socrat l. 5. c. 21.

Enseb. hist. Ec.

cles. lib. 5. c. 23.

Ecclesiarum ritus qui in singulis urbibus, regionibusq; valescunt, scriptis mandare ut valde laboriosum est, ita vix

vix aut ne vix quidem fieri poteſt. Cuiusq; enim religionis & ſectæ varij ſunt ritus, licet eadem de iſſis habeatur opinio, & qui in eadem fide conſentiunt, ydem ritibus & ceremonijs inter ipſos diſcrepant.

Thirdly, it muſt alſo be remembred that they were *libera obſervationis*, no one Church preſcribing to another, nor condẽning another for diverſity of ceremonies, but every one following their owne cuſtomes, and vſing that freedome that is agreeable to chriſtian liberty. This point is fully proued by many particulars in the place formerly alleadged out of *Socrates*, & moſt plainly delivered vnto vs, not only in the example of *S^t. Ambroſe*, *Cum Romam venio, ieiunio Sabbato, cum hic (Mediolani) ſum, non ieiunio*, but alſo by his adviſe and counsell com-
Aug. ep. 118.
ad Iannarium.
mended to S. Auguſtine, Sic etiam tu ad quã forte Eccleſiam veneris, eius morem ſerva, ſi cuiquam non vis eſſe ſcandalum, nec quengquam tibi. Which adviſe and counsell of *S. Ambroſe*, as often as *S^t. Auguſtine* thought vpon, he alwaies embraced as an oracle from heaven, becauſe hee had often found, and with much griefe lamented, that many weake brethren were troubled by the contentious obſtinacy, and ſuperſtitious feare of ſome men, who in thoſe matters, which cannot certainly be reſolved vpon, neither by the authority of the ſcriptures, nor by the tradiõ of the uniuerſal church, became ſo troubleſome that they thought well of nothing, but what they did them ſelues: Either becauſe they had ſome ſleight reaſon for there opinions, or becauſe the cuſtome of there Coũtry was otherwiſe, or becauſe they had ſcene things otherwiſe carried in ſome places where they had travailed, and therfore thought beſt of that, which they had learned furtheſt from home. Nowe out of theſe premiſ-

ses, we may gather this firme and sure Conclusion, That therfore the Ceremonies of those times were certainly of humane ordinance: or, to speake more properly, of Ecclesiasticall Constitution. For had God given any law concerning the, neither could the Jewish rites haue continued so long, neither could they haue bin so diuers as they were, neither could they haue bin of so free obseruation, but that one church must needs haue bin scandalized by another. And although this were sufficient to infringe the Treatisers proposition: yet I will giue the Reader a little taste of those things only, which antiquity hath alwaies commended in this kinde, that he may thereby be induced, to thinke the more reverently of Church Ceremonies. The translation therefore of the Sabbath into the Lords day, and that men praied with their faces towards the East, of whose ordinance and institution were they?

Aug. de Tem.
Serm. 25.

Of the first S^r. *Augustine* plainly affirmeth. *Apostoli & Apostolici viri, & sancti Doctores Ecclesie, decreverunt omnem gloriam Iudaici sabbatismi, in illam transferre.* The second also is very ancient as *Iustine Martyr* witnesseth referring it to the Apostles. *A quibus morem orandi accipit Ecclesia, ab iisdem etiam locum accepit: viz. à sanctis Apostolis.* In like manner we read that our Lord and Saviour instituted his supper in the Evening, and after meate, *Cum autem illi manducarent accepit Iesus panem, &c.* From whence then is it, that now for sixe hundred years, it is receaved in the morning, & before men eate?

Respons. ad orthodox. qu. 113.

feth referring it to the Apostles. *A quibus morem orandi accipit Ecclesia, ab iisdem etiam locum accepit: viz. à sanctis Apostolis.* In like manner we read that our Lord and Saviour instituted his supper in the Evening, and after meate, *Cum autem illi manducarent accepit Iesus panem, &c.* From whence then is it, that now for sixe hundred years, it is receaved in the morning, & before men eate?

Mat. 26.

For the former S^r. *Augustine* saith, *Saluator quo vehementius commendaret mysterij illius altitudinem, ultimum hoc voluit insigere cordibus, & memoriae discipulorum, à quibus ad passionem digressurus erat. Et ideo non precepit quod deinceps ordine sumeretur, ut Apostolis, per quos Ecclesias dis-*

Aug. ep. 118. ad
Jannarium.

diſpoſiturus erat, ſervaret hunc locum. For the latter hee demandeth, *Nunquid propterea calumniandum eſt univerſa Eccleſie quod à ieiuniis ſemper accipitur?* ex hoc enim placuit ſpiritu ſancto, ut in honorem tanti ſacramenti, in os Chriſtiani prius Dominicum corpus intraret, quàm exteri cibi. This cuſtome was in uſe therefore every where in his time, except only in ſome few parts of Egypt in the cuntries neere vnto *Alexandria* and *Thebaïs*, as *Socrates* obſerveth, *Quos probabilis quaedam ratio delectavit, &c.* as *S. Auguſtine* ſpeaketh in the ſame Epistle. It was afterwarde commanded in the third provincial councell of *Carthage*, *Can. 29.* and laſtly confirmed by the ſixt general councel in *Trullo*. The like may be ſaid of the Inſtitutiō of Hollydaies, of Lent, of kneeling in the time of public praier uſed all the yeare long, ſave only on Sundaies and Pentecoſt, on which daies the cuſtome was, *orare ſtantes*, to ſtand while they praied, for ſuch like reaſons peradvēture as *Iuſtine Martyr* yeelds for it. Laſtly thoſe ceremonies in praier mentioned by *Chryſoſtome*, *Cum manus extendis, pectus tundis, faciem in cælum erigis, & oculos aperis, quid aliud facis, quam ut totum hominem oſtendas Deo?* And thoſe other ſpoke of by *Tertullia*, *Illuc, id eſt in cælum, ſuſpicientes, manibus expaſis, capite nudo, genibus poſitis, manibus cadentibus pectus, facie humi volutata.* As alſo that they ſtood vp at the reading of the Gospels, & kneeled at the Sacrament, what other ground had they then humane Inſtitution? And I truſt that that ceremony of *virorum prior, ſæminariū poſterior ad menſam accubitus*, and all thoſe others, which our newe reformers would have brought in, either in their ſtanding, or ſitting, or walking at the Communion, if they might have prevailed, in their generall projects of a forme of Church

Aug. ad Jan. ep. 119. cap. 13. Tertull. de corona mill. cap. 2.

Inſt. Mart. reſpon. ad orithod. 94. 115.

Chryſoſt. in illa verba veri adoratores in ſp. & ver. adorabunt.

Tertull. Apol. cap. 30. & contra Judeos cap. 10.

Bez. ep. 24. ad 8.

Church & ciurgie, and of a Church discipline so often
tendred to the Parliament, would in short time haue
proved no better. then *humane deuises and inuentions*,
though neuer so fayrely coloured with the names of *A-*
postolicall customes. and honored with the most glorious
titles of, *The most holy Discipline, the scepter of Christ,*
and full placing of him in his kingdome. Concerning the
second, *that nothing becoming an Idoll* may lawfully be
vled in the seruice of God. Before I come to answer the
proposition, I desire the Reader a litle to obserue the
Treatisers phrased, and manner of speech. His phrase is
becomming an Idoll: will you know the reason? Hee had
not spoken home enough, if hee had only said *being abu-*
sed, for the word *abused*, would haue implied a good vse
once, which the Treatiser perhaps will not admit that
there was ever any of the Crosse. Neither thought he it
sufficient to say *abused to Idolatrie*, for then perhaps, it
would haue been too hard a talke for him to proue, that
nothing abused to Idolatrie may lawfully be vled in Gods
service. And therefore there was no remedy, his phrase
must needs be, *becomming an Idoll*. But how, I praie you,
may a humane ordinance become an Idoll? Doe you in-
tende by this speech a *Metamorphosis*, or *Transub-*
stantiation, whereby it ceaseth to be the nature it was,
and is turned into a nature it vvas not? But that is
cleane against the Apostles minde, who saith that *I-*
dolum: nihil est in mundo. Your meaning then must be,
that by the cogitation and minde of men, ascribing *deity*
to the ordinance, it was framed and made an Idoll. For o-
ther *essence* and *becomming* it can haue none. What
then needed this far fetched speech *becomming an Idoll*?
But that perhaps you meant thereby to expresse your
zeale

zeale, or rather, as I suppose, to astonish the ignorant, & make the signe of the Crosse more suspected, and odious to the people. But leauing the Treatisers speech let vs come vnto his matter.

• And here I must debate a litle with the Treatiser, whether the *matter* of an *Idoll*, (for the forme we see by the Apostles doctrine is none, but only in the minde and cogitation of the *Idolater*) whether I say, the matter of an *Idoll*, being siluer or golde, brasse, leade, or stone, &c. after it is altered & reclaymed from the *Idolatrous* vse, may not aswell be vsed in Gods seruice, as Churches, or Lands, or vessels may, which sometimes haue beene consecrated vnto *Jdols*: I am of opinion it may. For as *Tertullian* speaketh, *De simulachris ipsis nihil aliud deprehendo, quam materias sorores esse vasculorum, instrumentorumq. comunium*: and that therefore as they *Jdolaters* them selues, *Publicos et domesticos deos publicâ et domesticâ potestate tractarunt, pignerando, vendicando, demutando in Cacabulum de Saturno, in trullam de Minerva*, every man as his present will or necessitie required, so wee, abandoning the superstition, and imbracing the Creature, which God at the beginning made good, may apply it to his seruice. My reason is this. while the *Idoll*, & they things consecrated to the *Idoll*, were both abused to *Idolatrie*, they were both equally distant frō God, and alike removed from his seruice, differing noe otherwise, then that the *Idoll* was the thing worshipped, and the consecrated thinge, that where with it was worshipped. And suppose the *Idoll* were a litle farther estranged from God, and a stepp further in the power of the Deuil, yet, *Non desinit esse eius qui creauit*, No creature of God can be so farre alienated from him, vt

*Apol. cap. 12.
C 13.*

non possit quando vult repetere. Nihil enim ita est sub potestate Diaboli, quin ad gloriam et honorem dei possit converti. If this be granted (and as I thinke it wil not be denied) then this phrase to *become an Idoll*, importeth in effect no more, then to be abused to Idolatrie, or to be cōsecrated to the service of an Idol. Whereby it wil come to passe, that whatsoeuer may be alleadged, for the good and lawful vse of things in Gods service, that were sometimes abused to Idolatry, the same also may be alleadged to proue, that even that thing also may haue a good and right vse in Gods service, which sometimes hath beene an Idol it selfe. *Nec enim differt, saith Tertullian, Si extruas, vel exornes, si templum, si aram, si adiculum eius extruxeris, si bracteam expresseris, aut insignia, aut etiam domum fabricaveris.* Nay he goeth farther and plainly affirmeth, *Maiores est eiusmodi opera, quā nō effigiem cōfert, sed auctoritatem.* And in very truth the Artificer that made it knoweth well enough, that it is but woode or stone, &c. *Nondum Deus saxum est, lignum, aut argentū; Ecce ornatur, consecratur, oratur, tum postremò Deus est, cum homo illi valuit, & dedicavit,* saith Minutius, The greatest fault then is in him, that by erecting, adorning, and adoring of it, procureth vnto it the credit and opinion of a God. For by this meanes, *Etiam qui non inuenit vitalem motum, credit numen occultum: seductus forma, et commotus auctoritate, sine vivo aliquo Habitatore esse non putat.*

Tertull de Idol.
lat. cap. 8.

Wild. 13. 16.

Minus. in olza.

Ang. in Psal.
113.

Hauiug laide this foundation, I come nowe to examine the Treatisers proposition. And first, if we consider it in *Thesi*, That nothing once abused, may ever after bee well vsed, but must bee utterly abrogated and rejected. It will easely appeare to be, most vntrue, not on-
lic.

ly in thinges naturall and artificiall, which haue beene exceedingly abuſed: (for ſo wine muſt bee gone, becauſe it hath beene abuſed vnto drunkenneſſe: meats, becauſe ſome haue abuſed them to gluttonie: ſwords, becauſe by ſome cruell hands they haue beene imbrued in innocent bloude) but euen in thoſe things alſo, which are ſayd to be the deviſes & inuentions of prophane & heatheniſh Idolators, nay, euen of the heathen Gods theſelues, which yet might be thought moſt vnlike to be fitted to holy uſes, for that they haue proceeded from ſuch corrupt fountaines. Of *things naturall*, S^r. *Auguſtines* opiniõ is, *Si de arẽa vel torculari tollatur aliquid ad ſacrificia Dæmoniorum, etiã ſciente Chriſtiano, tamen utitur mundis reliquis fructibus, vnde illa ſublata ſunt, &c.* Euẽ as we uſe thoſe fountains, out of which we moſt certainly knowe, that water is drawn for the uſe of ſacrifices. Neither doubt we to fetch our breath frõ that aire, into which we knowe, that the ſmoke of al the altars, and incenſe of Deuils doth goe. For we muſt beware, leaſt that if we ſhall ſuppoſe, that we may not eate thoſe herbes which growe in the garden of the Tẽple of an Idoll, it alſo followe, that wee imagine, that the Apoſtles ought not to haue eaten bread in Athens, becauſe it was the Citty of *Minerua*, & conſecrated to her Deitie. This alſo may we anſwere of that well and fountaine which is in the Temple, and of thoſe ſacrifices which are caſt into the well and fountaine: nay more; which are therfore caſt into the water, to doe ſacrifice vnto the waters, Neither muſt we therfore reſuſe the benefite of this light, becauſe they ſacrilegious, when ſo they can, ceaſe not to ſacrifice vnto the ſame. Sacrifice alſo hath beene offered vnto the windes, which not

*Aug. Epiſt. 196
ad Publicolam.*

withstanding wee vse to our manifold commodity, although they themselves seeme as it were to draw in, and sucke vp the smoke of those sacrifices. Of artificial things likewise S^r. *Augustines* iudgment is the same. *Neg. exim pro patria non est miles armandus quia contra patriam nulli arma sumpserunt.* Nor therefore may not the good and skillful Physicians vse medicinal yrons for cure, and safety, becaule the vnskilful and ill-disposed men, doe vse the same for death and destruction. Otherwise no yron were to bee vsed either in house or field, for feare least some man should therewithal slay himselfe, or others: nor must there be a tree, or a corde remaining, for feare least any man should hang himselfe. Neither must we make any windowes, for feare least some one or other should cast himselfe headlong from the same. *Tertullian* also is of the same opinion, not only concerning those things, but of such things also as haue beene vsed and invented by the *Pagan Gods*. For, *Primus Mercurius literas excogitauerit. &c.* Let it be so (saith he) that *Mercury* was the first that invented *letters*; yet for al that I wil acknowledge them to be necessary, both for matters of commerce amongst men, and also for our studies towards God. Nay, say also that hee likewise invented *Musike*, neither wil I denie (knowing what *David* did) but that this invention also was agreeable to the Saints, & ministered in the service of God. Let *Aesculapius* be the first inventor of *medicines*: why, I remember that *Esaie* ministered a *medicine of figges* vnto *Ezechias* being sicke: and *Paule* could releeue *Timothy*, that a litle wine was good for his stomacke, and for his many infirmities. Yea, and though *Minerva* also first framed a *ship*, yet I see that *Ionas* and the Apostles sailed in *ships*. And, which is more, though every

*Tertull. de coron
mill. cap. 8.*

*Vide August. de
doct. Christi. li. 2
cap. 18.*

every thing, and veſſel neceſſarie for our uſe, had one of the heathen Gods to bee the author, yet that is no cauſe why Chriſt ſhould not be *cloathed*, or *S. Paule* not weare a *cloake*. And I muſt confeſſe alſo that Chriſt lay vpon a *bed*, and vſed a *baſon* when he waſhed his Diſciples *feete*: and that he powred *water* out of a *pitcher*, and was *girded* about with *Linnen*, the ſtuffe peculiar to *Oſiris*. Laſtly, *Ariſtotle* ſpeaking of the uſe of *Logicke* & *Rhetorick*. *Ariſt. Rhet. lib. Si obijciatur* (ſaith he) *quod valde nocebit is, qui utatur in- iuſte huiusmodi facultate rationū*, why this is an ordinary obiection againſt al good things (vertue only excepted) and moſt of al againſt thoſe things, which are moſt profitable, as ſtrength, health, riches, militarie diſcipline, &c. For theſe be things, which a man may doe much good withal, if he vſe them iuſtly; and exceeding much hurt, if he vſe them vniuſtly. The reaſon hereof is, becauſe the *euill uſing* of good things, proceedeth only from the corrupt nature of the *uſer*; and therefore cannot alter the goodnes of the creatures, which God hath made, and ſtamped vpon them this marke, that God ſaw that every thing that he had made, was exceeding good. *Gen. i.*

The ſelfe ſame reaſon alſo holdeth in *Hypotheſis*; to what thing ſo ever a man wil apply it, and is moſt true euen in the point we haue now in queſtion. Things abuſed to *Jdolatrie*, nay even to make an *Idol* it ſelfe, haue not therefore loſt al manner of good & holy vſe, becauſe the fault was not in the things ſo abuſed; but in the that abuſed them to. A prooſe hereof we haue in the Apoſtle *S. Paul*, who vſed that thing in the ſervice of God, whereof other men had made an *Idol*. For I demaunde. The *altar* in *Athens* hauing this inſcription; *unto the unknown God*, was it not a thing conſecrated to an *Idol*? Or rather,

not to digresse from the Treatisers phrase, was it not become an *Idoll* it selfe? I suppose the Treatiser will not deny it: for *S. Paule* reckons it among their superstitions, because they worshipped, they knew not what. And did not *S. Paul* vse it in the service of God? No doubt he did, when hee tooke the Inscription thereof for the text and theame of his sermon. Whom you ignorantly worship, him shew I vnto you. Lastly, did he not vse it lawfullie in Gods service? Jam perswaded hee did, both because the *Athenians* could not be better conuincd, then by their owne ignorant deuotions and superstitions, and also because God gaue a blessing to this sermon, in *Diomysius Areopagite*, and *Damaris*, and diuers others: according to the obleruation of *Cassiodore* in the *Tripartite* historie. *Ille sancto spiritu ditatus, multos Atheniensiu adduxit ad fidem, quando ea quae in ara erant scripta, sensu propria narrationis exposuit.*

Hist. Tripart.
lib. 9 cap. 29.

If this example will not content our Treatiser, I remitt him ouer to the 6. Chapter of *Iosuah* ver. 17. and likewise to the 6. Chapter of *Iudges* ver. 25. In the former place the Cittie of *Ierico*, and al the wealth therein was made *Anathema*, an execrable thing vnto the Lord: & yet all the siluer, & gold, and vessels of brasse & yron were consecrated vnto the Lord, and commanded to be brought into his Treasurie. In the latter place God commanded *Gedeon* to destroy the altar of *Baal*, and to cut downe the groue that was by it, and yet he would also haue the wood of the groue that was cut downe, and the bullocke that *Ioa*s the father of *Gedeon* had stalled seuen yeares, & had so long before ordained for a sacrifice vnto *Baal*, to be offred to him selfe for a burnt offering. And, why al this? but to make it manifest that God is the Lord

Iudg 6.25.

Lord of all things, and that nothing can be ſo farre gone into the power of the Devil, but it may be againe reclaimed to the honor, & ſervice of God. For although *Moses* in the golden Calfe, and *Ezechias* in the braſen Serpent, ſhewed each of the a memorable example of their religious zeale, and juſt anger againſt Idolatrie: the one by burning the Calfe in the fire, grinding it into powder, ſtrowin^g it vpon the water, and making the people drink thereof. The other by breaking the Serpent in peeces, and calling it *Nebuſhtan*, a vile and contemptible peece of braſſe: yet thoſe actions rather commend the zeale of thoſe good Princes, deteſting the Idolatry and Idols theſelues, then are any waies left for a neceſſarie rule for other men. For whereas there are two things memorable in theſe actions, the one, the taking away of the Idolatry, the other, that vtter deſtroying, and abolishing of the Idols; The firſt, is left to Chriſtian Princes & Magiſtrates for an example of imitation: The latter, as it increaſeth a commendation of their zeale, ſo it impoſeth no neceſſity on other men to doe the like: as may appeare, not only by the two former examples commanded by God himſelfe, but alſo by many other worthy, and famous re- formations made by Chriſtian Princes, in the Primitiue Church. Among whom one *Theophilus* is commended in the Tripartite hiftorie, for faithfullie perſourning the commandement of *Theodoſius* the Emperour, who had given him commiſſion, to deſtroy al the heathen Idols in *Alexandria*, & to imploy the matrer and riches of them, to good and holy vſes. According to which commande-
ment, *Idola Deorum deſtructa à Theophilo, ex mandato* Hift. Tripart.
Theodoſij Imperatoris, conſtabantur ad faciendas ollas, & lib. 9. cap. 27.
ad Alexandrinæ Eccleſiæ diuerſos vſus, cui ab Imperatore
do-

Epist. 154. ad
Publicolan.

donati fuerunt Dijs, ad expensas egentium. Many examples of the same *Theodosius*, and of *Constantine* the great in former ages, as also of other Christian Princes & Magistrates in their severall times, might be alleadged to this purpose. But I wil conclude this point with the most iudicious sentence and resolution of *S^t. Augustine*, whereby he confirmeth whatsoever I haue spoken. *Cū templa, Idola, luci, &c.* when Tēples, Idols, groues, or any things of like quality, by authorized power are ruinated and cast downe, if they be translated into common, and not proper vses, & converted to the honor of the true God, that falleth out in them, which hapneth also in men, when as of sacrilegious and vngodly persons, they become pliable and conformed to the true religion. And well may vvee imagine, that God hath intimated and taught vs this, in those testimonies which he laid before vs, when he commanded that the woods which grewe in the groues of strange Gods, should be vsed in the holocaust, and that al the gold, and silver, and brasse of *Ierico*, should bee brought into the Lords treasurie. If this iudgement of *S^t. Augustines* be true, then it is as lawful to vse the matter of an Idol, or to speak in the Treatisers language, that very thing that was become an Idoll, in the service of God, if it be reclaimed and remoued from Idolatrous superstition, as it is for a man, from an *Infidell* to become a *Christian*, or from an euil and wicked man, to become a true convert, and faithfull servant of God. And thus much to be answered to the *Mayor*.

The Minor.

But the signe of the Crosse, being a humane ordinance, is become an Idoll.

An-

Answer to the minor.

In the minor likewise there are two things comprehended.

First that the signe of the Crosse in Baptisme is a humane ordinance, which none of vs euer denied, but doe willingly acknowledg with *Tertullian* that, *Si legem expostules scripturarum nullam inuenies. &c.* And yet we cannot see, how this may ether aduantage the Treatisers cause, or exclude the signe of the Crosse, from being a lawfull and commendable Ceremonie, in the seruice of God.

But for all that J must desier the Treatiser, that he and J may demurre a little longer vpon this point. For, notwithstanding al that is already graunted, me thinks J may further say, that it is *so a humane ordinance*, as it is also a *diuine*, It is a *diuine* ordinance, in as much as it is a part of that decency, which is commended vnto vs by the Apostle: and it is a *humane* constitution, in as much as it doth particularly designe that, which in the generall was pointed at, rather then expressed. And this doctrine J learne of M^r. *Caluine* him selfe, who giueth this rule; *quia in externa disciplina, et ceremonijs &c.* Because God in outward discipline, and Ceremonies, would not prescribe any thing seuerally for vs to follow, (for that he fore-sawe that those things would depend most vppon the condition of times, neither iudged he one forme agreeable to al ages) in this case we must resort to those generall rules which he hath given, that according there vnto, al things may be examined, what soeuer the necessitie of the Church shall require to be commanded. Him selfe followeth this rule, and by the Ceremonie of kneeling in the time of solemne praies,

*Calu. Instit. lib.
4. cap. 10.*

I. COL. 14. 40.

which he vseth as an example for illustration, he giueth vs this general directiō, how to iudge of this whole matter of Ceremonies. Namely out of S^t Pauls general exhortation, *Let all things be done decently & in order*, to deduce every particular after this sorte.

What soeuer Ceremonie is done decently, and in order, is a part of S^t Pauls generall exhortation,

But the Ceremonie of kneeling at solemne prayers, is done decently and in order, Ergo.

it is a part of S^t Pauls generall exhortation.

Now because the Treatiser and his adherents, will hardly belieue that this particular Ceremonie of the Crosse in Baptisme, can as iustly, as that of kneeling be deduced, and applied out of this generall, I wil out of M^r. *Caluins* own grounds cleare this point also.

First this Ceremonie of the Crosse in Baptisme, hath in it that *Decorum* or *Decency*, that by M^r. *Calvin* is required. *Decorum*, or *decency*, as he teacheth, consisteth in these points. That it be so agreeable to the reuerence of holy mysteries, as it may also be a fit exercise to pietie, or at the least, that it adde a bewtie or ornament fit and agreeable to the action. And that not without fruit, but so as it may admonish the faithfull, with what modesty, religion, and obleruance, they should handle sacred things. All these parts of *Decorū* are in the Crosse.

It is agreeable to the *reuerent* maiestie of *sacred mysteries*. For what can be more agreeable to holy *mysteries* then the signe of that, which was the *consumation*, and *accomplishment* of *all holy mysteries*? Then the signe of that, whereon he hath nayled the Bill that was against vs: through the bloud of which *Crosse*, he hath set at peace, both the things in earth, and the things in heauen.

heauen. Secondly, it is a fit *exercise* vnto *pietie*. For, *Ad Christū rectā nos ducit*, It leadeth vs directiy vnto Christ De sanct. ser. 19
de verb. apost.
ser. 7. Tract.
in Ioan. 118. and putteth vs in minde of him that died for vs, shadow-
ing out vnto vs, the height, and breadth, length & depth
of his loue, as S. *Augustine* sheweth in diuerse sermons.
Thirdly, it is an *ornament*, *Quia crux Christi gloria Chri-
stiani*. an ornament fit and agreeable to the *action*: The
actiō is the *receaving* of the *child*, into the *body of Christ*,
and therefore most agreeable it is, that the childe shoulde
even then be *signed*, with the marke & badge of him, in
to whole service he is presently receaved. Fourthly, it is
not *without fruit*, but doth admonish the faithfull, with
what *modestie*, *religion*, and *observance* they should han-
dle *holymysteries*. Two things are commonly objected
by the Treatisers friends against the signe of the Crosse
in Baptisme. First that it is a *vaine & idle ceremony* of no
fruit, and to no *purpose*. Secondly, that by being *signifi-
cant*, and *symbolicall*, it bringeth a *newe worde* into the
Church. These two objections doe vtterly thwart & o-
verthrow each the other. Against the *second*, the iudge-
ment of *Caluin* in this conditiō is mainly opposire, who
hererequireth in the decencie of every ceremony, that it
be not without fruit, &c. intimating therby, that such ce-
remonies, as are not *significant*, must needs be vaine. A-
gainst the *first*: I am to answer now, & I doubt not but
it wil appeare, to be of much *fruit*, and to very *good pur-
pose*, if it do admonish vs of these things. And that it so
doth, I declare thus.

First it admonisheth vs of *modestie*, because it is as a
watchword, & secret remembrance, to keepe vs frō sin,
the grand *impugner* of *modesty*, & mother of shame, bring-
ing to minde, whatsoeuer Christ hath wrought, and we

Aug. tract. in
Ioan. 53.

Psalm. 141.

vowed against sin, and so causing that Christian men never want, a most effectual, though a silent *Teacher*, to avoide whatsoeuer may deservedly procure shame. And for that cause it is made vpon the forehead, *ubi est quodammodo sedes verecundiae; ut de nomine eius fides non erubescat, &c.* That we should neither be so bashfull, as to be ashamed of that, wherein there is no shame, nor so, *sine fronte* (as the same S. *Augustine* speaketh in another place) as not to feare that, which is the only deseruer and bringer on of shame.

Secondly, it doth admonish vs of *Religio*, for those reasons alleadged before in the cendition. *Sed, etsi solū hoc significat. quod ait Apostolus*, that they that belong to *Iesus Christ*, haue crucified the flesh, with the lusts, and concupiscences thereof, how great a good turne were that alone?

Thirdly, it doeth admonish vs with what *observance* holy things are to be handled, namely with an *awe*, & due regarde alwaies had, to the easines and familiarity of the Ceremonie, that it be *vicine, hard at hand, and obvious*, nor far fetcht, as *prophane* ceremonies commonly are, but, *admodum simplex*, & *praesentis admonitionis crucis Christi*, as M^r. *Bucer* in his censure iudgeth this to be.

Againe: this ceremony hath in it also that order which, in M^r. *Calvines* opinion, S^t. *Paule* intendeth, because it is done with such moderation in our Church, as may iustly take away al confusion, barbarity, contumacy, troubles, and dissentions, being so reduced to the first institution, as neither too much is ascribed vnto it, as in the manifold superstitions of *Poperie*: nor too little, or rather nothing at al, as in the confused phantasies of the *Anabaptists*. But you will say there are dissentions about this ce-

remonie in our Church, true, but in whome is the fault? not in our Church, that by the order of this Ceremonie, would take away al confuſion, tumult, and diſſention: but in thoſe *turbulent men*, who will neither admitt, *ut qui preſunt, regulam ac legem bene regendi nouerint, aut plebs que regitur, ad obedientiam Dei, rectamq; disciplinam aſſueſcat*, which is the firſt thing required in order: nor ſuffer, *ut bene compoſito Eccleſiæ ſtatu, paci et tranquillitati conſulatur*, which is the ſecond. And theſe be the true cauſes, why they cannot content them ſelues with the good order of this Ceremonie, but would haue *Novelties*, and alterations brought into our Church. But I leave them to be better aduiſed by the good counſell, and learned iudgment of *M^r Bucer*. * *Ad illos autē qui offenduntur*, vnto ſuch as be offended, becauſe ſome viſuall rites are yet retained, we may well anſwere, that if they would but conſider, howe neither diſcipline, nor order can be preſerued in the Church, without ſome Ceremonies, this might ſuffice to ſatiſſie them: For if we grant that, which cannot be denied, that it is behoueful, for ſome Ceremonies to be, it is then a neceſſarie conſequent, that viſuall Ceremonies, which we may well uſe, cannot be reprehended, even for that ſole antiquitie, which doth procure the rather authority, the reprooſe with all men that be carefull to continue the quietnes of publicke peace, and feare to be taxed for leuitie, and affected novelties, which al together, as much as poſſibly it may, ought to be auoided, in the propagation of true doctrine.

*Bucer. de ordin.
Miniſt. Eccleſiæ
Ang. cap. penult.*

Laſtly, this ceremony of the Croſſe in Baptiſme, hath in it al thoſe other *conditions* both *negative*, and *aſſimative*, that *M^r. Calvin* requireth in laudable Ceremonies.

First *negative*, it is not thought *necessary* vnto *saluation*, nor in that respect to *binde the conscience*. Secondly, it is not receiued with any opinion of *diuine worship* thereto belonging. *Affirmative*, it is accompanied with that *gravity*, that is required in al honest actions. Thirdly, it is *reuerend*, and may both procure a venerable regarde to the mysterie, and also bee a helpe to stirre vs vp to *pietie*. Fourthly, it tendeth to *edification*. And lastly, that it may want no complement, it hath his *generall* foundation in the *Scriptures*. And therefore by these rules of M^r. *Calvin*, may be wel said to be both a *diuine*, and *humane cōstitution*. *Diuine*, because it is founded vpon S. *Pauls* general direction, *Let all things be done decently & in order*. *Humane*, because the continual *vse* and *practise* of the Church, hath alwaies thought this *consignation* of the Crosse in Baptisme, one of those Ceremonies that are performed with decencie and order, & therefore iudged this *particular* to be fitly deduced out of that *generall*.

Secondly, that the signe of the Crosse is *become an Idol*. And herein lurketh, the whole deceit of the Treatisers *Sophisme*, who because it is confessed, that the Crosse hath beene abused among the Papists, and worshipped, *cultu latria*, as himselfe afterward shew eth, would therevpon inferre, that therefore the signe of the Crosse in Baptisme, cānot be wel vsed by vs Protestants. Our answer therefore in few words is this; If he meane that the Crosse is *become an Idol*, in the Church of *Rome*, we grant it. But what is that to vs? If he meane that the signe of the Crosse in Baptisme, is *become an Idol* in the Church of *England*, we deny it: & then to what purpose is this Treatise? For whereas he would make our Crosse in Baptisme, the same that it is in the Church of *Rome*,
 both

both in *name*, and in *forme*, and in *religious*, though not *Idolatrous* use, as he speaketh, it wil appeare vpo due examination to be vtterly vntrue. For to graunt that they are the same *in name* (for they are both called Crosse: & in *forme* (for they are both crosse lines drawn in the aire, and yet I must tell the Treatiser, that *their* vsing manie Crosse in the same thing, doth *diversificare formā*, make the forme diuers from vs that vse but one) yet the religious vse of them is notoriously different. For *first*, they giue vnto *their Crosse* *diuine power*, and vertue, as if it could *sanctifie* things crossed therewith, diue away Diuels, heale infirmities, & fence vs from all māner of danger: we ascribe *no such vertue or power vnto ours*. Secōdly, they yeeld vnto *their Crosse*, abilitie to *merite* pardon for *veniall sinnes*, to convert sinners, and to giue saluatiō: we yeelde *no such ability, or efficacie vnto ours*. As for their *Idolatrous vse*, whereby they *adore* and worshippinge their *Crosse*, *cultulatria*, we much more dissent frō them, and are tarre frō giving any *adoration*, or either outward or inward service vnto *ours*. So as it seemes the Treatiser vvas not wel advised when he said, their crosse & our crosse is the same in religious vse, for neither did hee remember (as I shal tel him hereafter) that we put no religion in the vse of the Crosse, as the Papists doe, but onlie vse it in a religious action: neither i beleue (if hee were wel put to it) could he shewe the difference betweene the *religious vse*, wherein he saith we agree with the Church of Rome, & the *Idolatrous vse*, wherein they differ from vs. For if *Religiōe veri cultus*, and *Superstitio falsi*, as *Lactantius* distinguisheth, I should thinke that *our vse*, being *veri cultus*, were only religious and *theirs* beeing nothing else, but *falsi cultus*, were only *Idolatrous*,

Lact. li. 4. c. 28.

trous, and superstitious. But I leaue the full sitting & examining of these points to there proper place. In the meane time I make this obseruation, out of the Treatisers owne mouth, that, contrary to his aimed intent, & purpose in this syllogisme, hee freeeth vs frō al Idolatrous vse of the Crosse. whence, against the malignitie of this *Minor* proposition, I gather this Conclusion out of the Treatisers owne words.

That which hath not an Idolatrous vse in our Church, is not an Idoll in our Church.

But the signe of the Crosse hath not an Idolatrous vse in our Church. Ergo.

The signe of the Crosse, is not an Idoll in our Church.

The *Maior* is plaine, for *Idolum*, & *Idololatria* are *Relatiues*, *Posito uno, ponitur et alterum*, For neither can an *Idoll* be, but where *Idolatrous* vse is, neither *Idolatrous* vse, but where an *Idoll* is. The *Minor* is the Treatisers owne proposition, and the truest proposition in his booke, and therefore the *Conclusion* must needs directly followe of the premisses.

The Conclusion.

Ergo, The signe of the Crosse may not lawfully be used in the seruice of God.

Answer to the Conclusion.

The Conclusiō of every syllogisme receaueth his virtue and strength of the premisses, which being firme & true, it standeth good, being weake and false, it faileth, & is of no effect. The *Maior* therefore of this syllogisme being false euery way, as hath been declared; and the *Minor* being vntreuely fitted, and applied, to the signe of the Crosse in Baptisme, vsed in our Church, This *Conclusion* striketh without any force, and missing the bodie,

body, lighteth into the aire, and hurteth not. And for any thing in this syllogisme contained, the Crosse may be stil both lawfully and commendably vled in the service of God. And thus much for answer to the maine syllogisme, the ground and foundation of this Treatise.

The Treatise. 1. Sect.

The vse of the Crosse in Baptisme is not a thing indifferent, but vtterly vnlawfull, for this reason; It is against the Apostles precept. 1. Joh. 5. 21. Babes keepe your selues from Idols.

Answer.

From the maine syllogisme, the Treatiser cometh to the prooffe, first of his *maior*, and then of his *minor*. For so he telleth vs in the margent, and we must needes beleue the margent, because it telleth vs so in Capital letters. For otherwise if we looke vpon the words prefixed immediatly before his prooffe, we shal finde a proposition, that is neither the *Maior* nor the *Minor* of the former syllogisme, but a mixture & composition of them both, for it hath the tearmes of *vnlawfull vled in the Maior*, & of *the Crosse in Baptisme vled in the Minor*, & of *a thing indifferent*, never yet mentioned in either proposition. So that leaving that as an *animal amphibion*, and of the two, likelier to be the *Minor*, I rather beleue the Margent then the Text. And that the Treatiser may in some honest sort seeme to conclude his fundamental proposition, I frame his argument after this manner.

Prooffe of the
Maior.

That which is against the Apostles precept, Babes keepe your selues from Idols, may not lawfully be vled in the service of God.

But the vse of an Idoll is against the Apostles precept, Babes keepe your selues, &c. Ergo;

E

The

The vse of an Idoll is not lawfull in the service of God.

The Maior proposition I grant to be true, but vpon these conditions.

1. That you take the word *against*, in his proper signification, for *contrary* or *opposite* vnto: & not for *prater* besides, or *otherwise* then the Apostle prescribeth, as most of your friends and favorites doe.

2. That herevpon you be not too insolent, and inferre this contrary conclusion *Ergo*, *Nothing* may be vsed in the service of God, but that which is in the Apostles precept. For there are *many things* laudably vsed in Gods service, whereof the Apostles haue giuen no precept. For whereas the Apostle St. Paul promised the *Corinthians*, *other things will I set in order when I come*, and yet neuer after *disposed*, or *set in order* thole *other things*, for ought that appeareth in any of his writings, our vndoubted perswasion is, that both the Apostles left *many things unordered* and *undisposed*: & also in matters of Ceremonie, belonging to *order*, *decencie*, and *edification*, there is alwaies a power left in the Church, to *dispose*, & *order* such things, according to the *several times*, *places*, *natures*, and *occasions* of every Church.

— To the *Minor* I answer, that the vse of an Idoll, *quatenus an Idoll*, that is, while it is an Idoll, or as long as it retains the forme, credit, and estimation of an Idoll, is indeede against the Apostles precept: but this is no hindrance, why wee may not vse that thing in Gods service, which is now reclaimed from the Idolatrous vse, though we certainly know, that it was sometimes vsed as an Idoll, as before hath bin declared. For those things which are recovered out of the euil vses, wherevnto they were applied, and restored to holy vses in Gods service; *Ipso*
mi-

ministerio consecrata sancta dicuntur, in eius honore, cui pro nostra salute inde servitur. Aug. in ps. 113.

But let vs now see how the Treatiser doth first explaine the sentence of S. Iohn in this next section, & afterwarde confirme his explanation in the third.

Treatise. 2. Sect.

For the explanatiō where of two things are to be scanned. First, what is meant by an Idoll. Secondly howe far we are to keepe our selues from Idolles, An Idoll is, *Quicquid prater Deum diuino colitur honore:* and though some restraine an Idoll, to a visible forme, because it is deriued, *Unde q̄d̄ eĩd̄s*: yet, as a learned writer obserueth, *Qui de omnibus idololatriæ generibus acturi sunt, latius nomen Idoli accipiant necesse est. Idoli igitur nomine intelligitur, quicquid homo vel simpliciter vel c̄n, sibi extra verum Deum proponit, fingitq̄, colendum.* Neither is this spoken without good reason, for nothing is properly an Idoll, quatenus est visibilis forma, sed quatenus religiosè colitur. If therfore it be worshipped, it may be an Idoll, though it be no visible shape: otherwise the worshipping of Angells. & the soules of the iust men, were no Idolatry, seeing these are inuisible spirits. And therfore the signe of the Crosse, if it be religiously worshipped, may proue an Idoll, though it bee, *transiens quiddam, a thing vanishing in the aire, and no permanent forme.* For as that learned Zanchie speaketh, there is, *duplex Idolum, the one reall, the other, imaginariũ & tantum mente conceptum.* Zanch. de re- demp. li. 1. c. 17.

For answere to the second Question. Men may keepe them selues from Idolls two wayes, viz. a cultu, & ab usu Idoli, from the worship, and from the vse of the Idoll. For the first S^r. Paule is so strict, that he alloweth not the Christians, so much as to be present in the Temple, at the

Idolatrous feasts, though they did it without any internall opinion, or externall action of worshipping the Idoll.

But Iohn in this place doth not speake so much of the worshipping, as the vse of the Idoll, for (as Augustine in psal: 113. well obserueth) the Apostle commandeth, *ut caueant non tantum a cultu simulacrorum, sed a simulacris ipsis*, that they avoid not only the worship of the Images, but also the Images or Idols themselves.

Now the vse of an Image or Idoll may be ciuil, or religious: and both of them, publike, or private.

That an Image, euen such an Image as is Idolatrously worshipped, may be made and retained for ciuil respects, of ornament, story, or such like, we make no question, though the tolerating of them, in open and publike places, *extra cultum*, be offensive, and turne into a snare, as Geacons Ephod was to his posterity, when it was abused to Idolatrie. And upon this ground we yeeld, that though the Croſſe be apparantly an Idoll, yet in Princes banners, coronations, coyne, Crowne, or any other ciuil respect, it may haue lawfull vse. But that any thing of mans deuising, being worshipped as an Idoll, should be vsed; *Religionis ergo*, and in the worshipping of God, seemeth directly against S^c. Iohns precept, for, how do I keepe my selfe from the Idoll, or, how do I shew my zealous detestation of that filthy Idolatry, when I retaine it, & vse it so honorably as in the Temple, in the Sanctuary, in the seruice of God? Vvhich interpretation of this place of S^c. Iohn, the Church of England doth, on the warrant of Tertullian, approue & commend.

Answer

In the explanatiō of the first point, what is meant by an Idoll, I see not any great matter to be dissented in, from the Treatiser: only I perceauē not, how by any of these de-

descriptions, the Crosse may bee made an Idoll: neither in the explanation of his second point, *howe wee are to keepe our selues from the Idoll*, is any thing greatly to bee reprov'd, so long as hee speaketh of keeping our selues, *a cultu Idoli*, from the worshipp of the Idoll: only I must tel him, that those words, which he citeth out of S^t. *Augustines* words, vpon the 113. Psalme, *ut caneant non tantum &c*, either are not S^t. *Augustines* vpon that Psalme, or else my booke and his do disagree. For I haue diligently sought for them, al that Psalme ouer, but cannot finde them: which I do not obserue, as if I tooke exception against the Treatiser: for, *facilis est error*, a man may easely misse in a quotation: or against the words them selues, let them be S^t. *Augustines*, or the Treatisers, or any other mans; and let them forbidd both the worshipp, & vse of Idols, as much as they can, we mislike both the one, and the other, as highly as the Treatiser him selfe doth. The things that in this section I take exception vnto, are in those points he deliuereth, *de usu Idoli*, as:

1. These words. *That an Image, even such an Image, as is Idolatrously worshipped, may be made, and retained for ci. will respects of ornament, and such like, there is no question though the tolerating of them, in open and publicke places, even extra cultum, be offensiue, & turne into a snare, &c.* The first part, *That they may bee made and retained for ci. will respects of ornament or such like*, we easily grant: but those other words, *Though the tolerating of them, bee offensiue, & turne into a snare*, sound harsh in mine eares, not only becaule they conaine a flat contradictiō to the Treatisers owne words a little after, where he saith, that without doubt, the meaning of the second commande-

ment is, to binde the Church from al such snares, and allurements to sin, and that al occasions & meanes leading thervnto, are likewise prohibited: but especially, because they containe a contradiction to the truth. For *what els* gaue occasion to *Jdolatry* at the first, but the *vaine glory* of men, making *statues*, and *portraits* of their *triumphes*, and for the *memory* of them whom they loued? Which at the first were *civill respects*, but when they came to bee a snare, were no better then *Jdols*. Had the Treatiser well observed the nature of the words, which he here deliue-
 reth, he would haue found, that nothing is *Scandalum*, *offensue*, or a stumbling blocke, til it bee set to make men stumble: nor a *snare*, till it be laid to catch and intangle. Such things are no longer tollerated, then while they re-
 taine their civil respects: if once they become *offensue*, and *snares*, then God commaundeth presently, *Cast vp, cast vp, prepare the way, take up the stumbling blockes out of the way of my people.*

Ma. 57. 14.

Againe, if this speech of the Treatisers be true, as hee makes no questiō, what reason hath he to be more friend-
 ly to an *Image*, even such an *image as is Jdolatrously worshipped*, though &c. then to our Crosse in Baptism, which is neither an *image*, nor *Jdolatrously worshipped*, nor *retained*, *cum opinione cultus*, nor *offensue*, or a *snare* to any, but such as wilbe offended without cause? If either I in this answer, or any other of the *conformable Cleargie*, should suffer this, or such a like speech to fal from vs, we straightway should be reckoned Antichristian, and Popish, and favourers of *Jdolatry*: but our Treatiser, & his friends, may say what they wil, and yet alwaies bee com-
 mended.

The next words immediatly following are as lavish as
 the

the former. Upon this ground wee yeelde, that though the Crosse bee apparantly an Idoll, yet in Princes Banners, &c. First, your ground is weake, as euen now we declared, & then if the Crosse be apparantly an Idoll, neither Princes Banners, nor Crowne, nor Coine, nor any other ciuill respect, can make it haue a lawfull vse. Your perpetual arguing from *secundum quid ad simpliciter*, doth bewray an exceeding desire to deceiue both others, and your selfe. For, be it granted, that the Crosse is an Idoll *secundū quid*, that is, according to the vse of the Church of Rome, will you thence conclude *simpliciter*, that therefore the Crosse, among whom, and wheresoever, and vsed howsoever, is apparantly, & *simpliciter* an Idoll? who seeth not the childishnesse of this caption?

3 The third speech argueth the Treatiser to bee both iniurious, and malicious. *Iniurious*, in that he saith, *that the Crosse, a thing of mans devising, being worshipped as an Idoll, is vsed by vs in the worship of God*; for neither vse we that thing, which is worshipped as an Idoll, because there is nothing like between our Crosse, & their Crosse but the name only, as is before declared in the answer to the *minor*: neither do we vse the Crosse, as a thing to worship God thereby, but only as a thing to put vs in remembrance of our duty. *Malicious*, in that he saith, it is vsed by vs, *Religionis ergō*, for *Religionis ergō* in this place, is the same phrase with *Religionis causa* afterwards: And in my vnderstanding is properly Englished, for the *Religions sake*, or *because of the Religion*, that we suppose to bee in it: and therefore the Treatiser doth but double, and dissemble, when he translateth *Religionis ergō*, to *retaine it, and vse it, so honorably as in the Temple, in the Sanctuary, in the service of God*. For out of what Authors can he shew,

shew, that to vse a thing, *Religionis ergò*, signifieth to vse a thing in the outward seruice of God the Treatiser knows well enough, that these speaches differ, & beare not the same meaning: and yet is content to fatten vpon vs, that we vse the Crosse *Religionis ergò*, which is a most malicious calumniation. And I must tel him the more plainly of this iuggling, because he vseth it very much, and thinks it a fit bait to catch the simple, True it is, we vse the signe of the Crosse, in a religious action, namely in Baptisme, but we vse it not *Religionis ergò*, with anie concept or opinion of Religion, that we ascribe vnto it; and this I giue the Reader as a perpetual caveat, against the grand imposture of the Treatiser. In vaine therefore is that which he addeth of the Church of England, approving & commending of Tertullians interpretation of this place of Iohn, worthely it is approved, and commended, as most fit and agreeable therevnto. Tertullian never meant those words against the sign of the Crosse in Baptisme, of which he alwaies speaketh most honorably: neither doth the Church of England in that Homilie, otherwise apply his testimony, then to the detestation both of the service or worshipping, and also of the very shapen and likenes of the Images or Idols themselves, his wordes there, are *effigies & imago*, as the same Homily doth well obserue. Our Crosse is neither of them both.

Treatise. 3. Sect.

And this point is further strengthened by the seconde commandement, which forbiddeth not only to worship, but euen to make an Image, or any similitude what soever, to wit ad cultū, or for religious vse, as according to the scripture the best interpreters, partly against Images in Churches, partly on the words of the precept do most naturally expound it.

it. For surely if Idolatry it selfe, as a most execrable thing, be forbidden, then all occasions & meanes leading therunto are likewise prohibited, & what stronger provocation to that spiritual whoredome, the erecting Images, in the place of Gods worship? Plus enim, vt rectè Augustinus in Psalm. 113. valent simulacra ad curuandam infelicem animam, quòd os habent, nares habent, manus habent, pedes habent, quàm ad corrigendam quòd non loquentur, nò vident, non audient, non odorabunt, non tractabunt, nò ambulabunt.

And therefore without doubt, the meaning of the commandment is, to binde the Church from all such snares & allurements to sin. And therefore doth Augustine in quest. super Leu. q. 68. wel conclude from this cōmandement, that such making of an Idoll, can never be iust or lawfull.

Now if no similitude at all be tollerable in Gods service, then much lesse any that hath beene, and is worshipped Idolatrously.

Tertullian against the Gnosticks, accompted them Idolaters not only which worshipped, but those also which made and retained Images (nempe ad cultum, or for holie use) and in his booke, de Idololatria, hee vehemently reproveth the very makers of Images, though they did not themselves worship the, which sheweth in what execration the Primitiue Churches held any religious use of an Idoll.

The like we may finde in Epiphanius, ad Johannem Episcopum Hierosol. where he reporteth, that finding an Image of Christ or some Saint hanging at a Church dore, he rent it in peeces, avouching, that to hange a picture in the Church of Christ, was contra autoritatem scripturarum, contra religionem Christianam, contrary to the authority of the scriptures, and the Christian Religion.

From hence I conclude, that if the godly fathers were so vehement against the erecting of the Images of Christ, & of Saints, euen at that time before any worship was giuen vnto them: Much more would they withstand it now after men haue made Idolls of them. And if they would not suffer an Idoll, so much, as in the place of Gods worship: would they endure themselves to vse such an Idoll as the Crosse in the seruice and sacramentes of God? Their zeale against that spirituall fornication, would neuer permit them so highly to honor such an execrable thing: neither was their zeale herein without ground of knowledge, for the spirit of God in Psal. 115. 8. speaking of Idolls, They (saith he) that make them, are like vnto them, and so are all they that trust in them. Where a plaine difference is made betwene makers, and worshippers of Idolls, and both condemned as Cursed transgressors of the Law. Shall any then make the Idoll of the Crosse, & that Religionis causa, and yet be innocent?

Isa. 50 22.

Questionlesse by Dauids example, we must make no mention, that is, keep no honorable memory of an Idoll, & therefore without doubt, not giue it so much honor as to vse it, or the memoriall therof in the house of God, & in his holy worship: but as Isai. saith, we must pollute the reliques, & the very couering and ornament of the Idoll, and cast the away as a menstruous cloth, & say vnto it, get thee hence.

Answer.

The Treatiser confirms his explanation of the sentence of St. Iohn by the second Commandement, & by the testimonies of S. Augustine, Tertullia, & Epiphanius therunto applied. Wherin giuing way to his allegatiōs, because they are only against Idolatry, and making of Images to worship them, I only marke his *scapes*, and

over-

overreachinges, wherof the first is in these words *Ad cultum*, or for *Religious vse*: where I note, that how loeuer in words, he would faine make *Cultus*, and religious vse differēt things, that so he might seeme to follow his proposed diuision, *de cultu et usu*, yet in his proofes he makes them both one; A manifest argument; that in all this discourse he neuer commeth nere our vse, of the Crosse in Baptisme, which is so farre from *Cultus*, and *religious vse*, (as he vnderstands it) that we neither worship it, nor suppose any religion to be in it, as I said even now.

A second scape of his, is in this conditionall Collection, vpon the second Commandement, and testiōies of S^r. *Augustine*, *If no similitude at all, be tolerable in Gods seruice, then much lesse any, that hath bin, and is worshiped Idolatrously*. For whereas the second Commandement, & all his proofes there vpon, run mainly against *Cultus*, or *religious vse*, (which to him are both one) he cānot thece cōclude, that therfore the vse of some *similitudes*, in a *religious action*, without any worship ascribed vnto them, or opinion of religion reposed in them, is not tolerable. For by this generall restraint, beyond the nature of his proofes, he may as well exclude the vse of *Sacramēts* out of Gods seruice, which certainly are some kiud of *similitudes*, of those things which they doe represent: according to that of S^r. *Augustine*, *Si sacramēta quādam similitudinē earū rerū, quarum sunt sacramēta non haberent, omnino sacramēta non essent*. Againe his illation and inference vpon this supposition, is likewise false: for though that were true: yet some thing, that hath bin heretofore idolatrously worshiped, may lawfully be tollerated now; and some thing that even now is ido-

Aug. ep. 23. ad
Bonifacium.

latrouſly worſhiped, (which yet is not granted of the ſigne of the Croſſe in Baptiſme, as ſhall hereafter appeare) may be lawfully tolerated in ſome other, that are free from all conceite of Idolatrie, as formerly hath bin declared.

Thirdly, hee over-reacheth in his collection vpon the words of *Tertullian* and *Epiphanius*, where hee alkerh, *woulde they endure themſelves to uſe ſuch an Idoll as the Croſſe, in the ſervice and ſacraments of God?* We anſwer, they would, ſuch an Idoll, as our Croſſe is: And we are perſwaded that both they, & *St. Auguſtine* too, would like it wel enough. When they ſhoulde perceiue, that without epinion of ſuperſtition, or efficacie aſcribed vnto it, it were reclaimed to the very ſame ſymbolicall or ceremoni-
all uſe, it had in their times, howſoeuer in the times betwene them and vs, it hath bin abuſed by ſome to Idola-

*Epiph. lib. 10. 2.
contra hereſ.
Ebionit.*

*Tertull. de coron
mil. cap. 3.*

T. C. lib. 1.

*Aug. ſerm. 181.
de temp.*

*Aug. ſer. de ven-
tio domini.*

tric. *Epiphanius* miſliketh it not in his time, as may appeare in that narration he maketh of *Joſephus. Tertullia*, we are ſure, would indure it wel enough, who ſo often & willingly mentioneth it, and in all his writings commendeth the vſe of it, *Ad omnem progreſſum atq. promotum, ad omnem aditum & exitum, ad veſtitum & calceatum, ad lavacra, ad menſas, ad lumina, ad cubicula, ad ſedilia, quaecunq. nos cōverſatio exercet. frontem crucis ſignaculo terminas.* Inſomuch that T. C. pronounceth (tull raſhly & without al cauſe) that the Lorde left a marke of his curſe vpon it, for comming out of the forge of mans braine, & being ſo much abuſed. And for *St. Auguſtine*s opinion I refer you to his hundred eighty & one ſermon, *de tempore*, or if that pleaſe you not, to his ſermon *de verbis domini*, where hee ſaith. *Quod ipſe honoraturus erat fideles ſuos in fine huius ſaculi, prius honoravit crucē in hoc ſeculo,*

culo, &c. Qued cū magna Insultatio e persecutores Iudæi Domino procurarunt, cum magna fiducia serui eius, etiam & reges in fronte nunc portant. And yet notwithstanding al this, we are as well, and better perswaded of their vehemency against *erecting of images*, and of their zeale against *spirituall fornication*, then the Treatiser is, & can more easily be induced to beleue, that their zeale herein was not without knowledge, then these men can so slenderly acquaint themselues with their knowledge, or zeale: and as in this: so in all other pointes, never cite any testimonie out of them sincerely, and according to their meaning.

Fourthly, the Treatiser much overlatheth, where hee marshals vs among the worshipers of Idols, Concluding that streine of his with this forcible *modus*, *shal any then make an Idoll of the Crosse? and that Religionis causâ, and yet be innocēt?* True it is. The prophet *Dauid* saith. *They that make them are like vnto them, &c.* but what? is his meaning that they are like vnto them for simply making them? I trust no: for then how wil you iustifie your former words? that *an Image may be made and retained for Ciuil respects*, we make no question: His meaning is thē, They that make them to worship them, and to put their trust in them, as all *Idolatrous makers* doe, are like vnto them, we make the Crosse indeed, but neither to worship it nor to put our trust in it: And therefore I hope are no more to be Condemned as cursed Transgressors of the Law, then you are when you write the letters of *T. C.* name, which you cannot do but you must needs make a Crosse. And I think verily, that you put more religion in this *T.* then our Church doth in the *signe* of the Crosse. As for your *Crābe of Religionis causâ*, it is answered be-

Wild. 13. 17.

fore, and is an odious imputation, by you fastened on our Church, without all colour of truth.

Treatise. 4. Sect.

Now if any doubt, whether the signe of the Crosse be adored: & so made an Idoll: let him well consider the tract of Bellarmine, de adoratione crucis, where distinguishing the Crosse on which Christ was hanged, from the similitude thereof, he saith, ceteræ cruces illi similes, inter sacras imagines numerantur. And after he distinguisheth those similitudes of Christs Crosse, into the Image, & signe of the Crosse, so that if the Image of the Crosse bee taken for an Idoll, (& who knoweth not that it is the universall Idoll of Popery, & to be adored, even cultu latriæ, which worship, as they themselves holde, is due only unto God.) the signe of the Crosse must needs be taken for no better. Besides, the same Bellarmine having, as is said, distinguished the crosse into three sorts, the true Crosse, the image of the Crosse, and the signe of the Crosse, he laieth downe this doctrine generally of them all, omnes cruces adoramus, and particularly of the signe of the Crosse hee saith, signum crucis quod in fronte, vel in aere pingitur, esse sacrum & venerabile. To this agreeth Pörförmus Sarib. 4. where it is thus professed, adoramus crucis signaculum, per quod salutis sumptimus sacramentum.

De Imag. li. 30

De Imag. lib. 2.
cap. 29.

Confer. with
Hart. cap 8. di-
vis. 4. pag. 509.

And that the Image, & signe of the Crosse, is of one, & the same accompt with Papistes, appeareth evidently, as by diverse, so particularly by Hart. For Doctor Raynolds, shewing that the Church of Englande, hath iustly left the signe of the Crosse out of the supper, for the Idolatry thereof, doth proue that it is worshipped as an Idol, by such testimonies, as indeede belong to the image of the Crosse, which Hart no way excepted against, doth imply, that looke what

estima-

estimation they haue of the Image, the same they haue of the
 signe: & what honor is due to the one, is due to the other. For
 in very deed they carefully teach, that it is not in regard of
 the matter, wherein the Crosse is painted, or the colour
 whereby it is shadowed, but only & simply. for the expressing
 of the likenes of Christes Crosse, & for the representing of
 Christ crucified (which the signe performeth as well as the
 image) that they adore the Crosse with the same honor, that
 is due unto Christ himselfe: And this no doubt was the
 meaning of Aquinas, when he saith, that every effigies or
 likenes of the Crosse (whereof the signe is one) is to be ado-
 red cultu latræ: and Costerus doth avouch, that the same
 worship is due to the signe, as belongeth to the very Crosse
 of Christ. VVhē he saith (though falsly) Christiani, à Chri-
 sti temporibus, semper summa veneratione coluerunt
 ipsum signum dominicæ crucis, & signum crucis, quo se
 quotidie muniunt, Marke that the signe of the Crosse is
 worshipped, summa veneratione, with the highest degree
 of honor, and, as Andradius in expresse words saith, In the
 same māner, that the Image of Christ himselfe is worship-
 ped: then the which, what can be more cleere to prooue, that
 not only the Image, but the signe of the Crosse, is by Papiſts
 most Idolatrously worshipped?

If any say, that to the signe of the Crosse none boweth the
 knee. or vaileth the bonnet, and therefore it is not adored.
 I answer first, that adoration is interne, and externe: and
 the externe adoration is therefore Idolatry, because it pro-
 ceedeth from the interne, as Zanchius very learnedly, and
 largely sheweth.

If a man may invoke to an Angell, or giue any honour
 internal to a creature, shall it not be called Idolatry, except
 he bow outwardly unto it? How then doeth Paule saie that

Andr. Ortheod.
 explic. lib. 9.
 Bellar. de imag.
 lib. 2. cap. 50.
 1. 1. 2.
 1. 1. 4.

Th Aquin pare
 3 q. 25 artic. 4.

Coster. Euch.
 cap. 11.

Orth. explic.
 lib. 9.

Zanch. de re-
 dempt. lib. 6. c. 17

Eph. 5. 6.
Coloss. 3. 9.
Mark. 10. 29.
1. Tim. 6. 19.
Luk. 12. 15.
Phil. 3. 19.

Quest. disput.
de venial pecc.

Consciousnes is Idolatry? For a rich man doth not outwardly worship his goods; yet because he giueth vnto it interne confidence, which is due vnto God, it is truly called his Idol, as vnto the Sardanapali there bely is termed their God: Right so the Papists ascribing to the signe of the Crosse, that honor, & confidence which belongeth to God, doe make it an execrable Idol, & so most unfit to stand in the sanctuary, or to be annexed to the holy things of God. For first they ascribe vnto the signe of the Crosse, power & vertue to meritt pardon, at the least for veniall synnes, as appeareth by Tho. Aquinas, Bellarmine, and the Rhemites.

Also it is held, to partake of power efficient, and immediately operative, and that to conuert sinners: Marshall de cruce. fol. 114. 115. yea to gaine saluation, Hosius contra Brent: pag. 227. and generally the whole rabble of Romish Doctors, doe teach to put great affiance in this signe, for chasing away diuells, and curing diseases, and sanctifying both man, and other Creatures to the vse of man.

Secondly I say indeed, they doe giue out ward, as well as inward worship to the Crosse. For it is apparant, that they innocate it, in the same manner, that they innocate Saints, when they say. Per crucis hoc signū fugiat procul omne malignum. By this signe of holy Crosse, let euills all flie farr from vs. Again by the signe of the holy Crosse, from our enemies deliuer vs o Lord our God. Also in another place, victorious Crosse and admirable signe, make vs triumph and ioy in heauenly Courts diuine: yea in prayers, they ioine it with Iesus Christ, as in officio Missæ, is to be seene, where they supplicate, per misericordiam Iesu Christi, per auxilium & signum Crucis, per intercessionem beatæ Mariæ, &c. They couple it also with the bloud of Christ, in these words, defend me Iesu ab omnibus vitijs, malis
præ

præteritis, presentibus, & futuris, per signum sanctæ crucis, & per inestimabile pretium iusti, & pretiosi sanguinis tui. *All which doth most manifestly proue, that among the Papists it is religiously honored, both with inward confidence, and outward reuerence.*

Answer.

Though al that the Treatiser alleadgeth in this sectiō, should be graunted, yet nothing is concluded against our Crosse. For whereas his conclusion should be this, *Ergo. the signe of the Crosse in Baptisme, as it is used in the Church of England, is an Idoll,* he bringeth vs only this conclusion, *Ergo. the signe of the Crosse, in the Church of Rome, is an Idoll,* his argument is this.

What soeuer the Church of Rome doth adore, with diuine honor, & wherunto it yeeldeth both interne cōfidence, & outward worshipp, is an Idoll,

But the Church of Rome doth adore the sign of the Crosse with diuine honor, & yeeldeth vnto it interne cōfidence, & outward worshipp, Ergo.

The signe of the Crosse, in the Church of Rome, is an Idol.

The Maior is false. *What soeuer the Church of Rome doth adore, &c* For so the bread in the Lords supper, should likewise be an Idoll, *because the Church of Rome doth adore it, with diuine honor, and yeeldeth both interne confidence, and outward worshipp therevnto,* as is better objected, then answered in the first obiection. Again, if vnto those words, *what soeuer the Church of Rome doth adore &c. is an Idoll,* you had added those words, *in the Church of Rome,* your Maior had beene true, & we should not haue denied it. But from *secundū quid*, to cōclude *ad simpliciter*, (as you alwaies doe,) is too simple a Conclusiō to deceaue any man, that is but a meane Logician: wee

graunt that their is, *eadem ratio urbis et orbis*: nor that that must needs be an Idol in every place, that the Church of Rome hath made an Idol within her owne Jurisdiction.

Touching the *Minor*, we partly graunt it, and partly denie it: we graunt it, *De signo crucis materiali*, such as were *Crucifixes*, of wood, stone, or mettall, & plaine *Crosses* of all sorts, without the *Image* of Christ. And so we vnderstand all your proofes, two only excepted; whereof you shal heare our answer by and by. *De signo*, or rather *de consignatione crucis immateriali*, drawn in the aire, or vpon the forehead, without any print remaining, we denie it, and answere to your two proofes. the one out of *Bellarmino*: *Signū crucis quod in fronte, Vel in aere pingitur, est sacrum & venerabile*: the other out of *Costerus*. *Christiani summā veneratione coluerunt signum crucis, quo se quotidie muniunt*. that there is great difference betweene *veneratio*, the word that they vse in thole places, and *adoration*, the word that you applie vnto them; The first expressing only a reuerent regard, that they haue of the signe; The other a religious worship, which you say, they yeeld vnto it. J wil not take vpon me their defence, nor iustifie their aburdities, for J willingly acknowledge, that they haue too too superstitiously thought of this *consignation* also, and extended their *summa veneratio*, to the highest degree of superstitious opinion, in ascribing too much power, vertue and efficacy thereto, as you declared in the second place of this Section. But yet J cannot be perswaded, that *signum sacrum & venerabile*, or *summa veneratio*, as they call it, do signifie *adoration*, with diuine honor, or interne confidence, and out ward worship, as you affirme. —

Three things therefore I answere to the *Minor*. First, That

That the *Papists* doe indeed very *superstitiously* deeme, of the *consignation* of the Crosse in Baptisme, that it is of *vertue, force, & efficacy*, which we do utterly & in plaine termes deny. Secondly, I suppose that the Treatiser will never be able to proue, that the *cōsignatio* of the Crosse in Baptisme, (evē in the grossest time of *Poperie*) was ever made an *Idol*, or had any *divine adoration*, or *interne worship*, or *externe honour* exhibited vnto it. For first, howe could it, the thing ceasing to bee, as soone as ever it was made? and then, who should worship it? The *childe* could not, the *Priest* & people reflected rather their devotion to their *materiall wooden Crosse*, and *mettall Crucifixes*, which they had ever at hand, then to this *immateriall transient* marke. *Accertum est, omnes ferè Idololatrias solitos semper fuisse, neq; Deum, vel verum, vel falsum, vel ullam creaturam, externa adoratione colere, & adorare, nisi sub, & in aliquâ figurâ illum representante*, and so farre only holdeth that, which you alleadge out of *Tho. Aquinas*, that every *effigies*, or likenes of the Crosse, is to be adored, with the same honor, that is due vnto the *Prototypon*: namely, if it be *effigies*, a *materiall* shape or similitude, which remaineth *post opus*, not the *immateriall effigatio*, or signing, that passeth, and leaueth no impression, after the Action. As for your allegations out of *S^t. Paule*, that *covetousnes* is *Idolatry*, and that vnto the *Sardanapali*, their belly is their God, the comparison is not equal. For the *divine honor*, that you conceiue to be founded in *consignatione crucis*, is grouided only vpon a thing *transient*, & *imaginary*, but contrarywise, the *Idolatry* of the covetous man, and *felicity* of the belly-god, are both founded in *materiali obiecto*, vpon a reall, & not vpon an *Imaginary* foundation; *Auarus tribuit thesauris suis quod*

Zanch de redemp. li. 1. ca. 17.

Tho. Aqu. p. 3. q. 25. 4. cap.

Eph. 5. 6. Coll. 3. 5. Phil 3. 19.

Zanch de redē. lib. 1. cap. 17.

proprium est Dei, & Sardanapalus sagina suam felicitatem.

Thirdly, I asseme, that though Poperie hath esteemed superstitiously of the Crosse in Baptisme, which wee confesse, and given diuine honor vnto it, which we thinke may very probably be denied: yet our consignation in Baptisme, is altogether different from theirs, as before hath bin declared in the answer to the Minor of the maine Syllogisme.

Treatise. 5. Sect.

And therefore if their Idols, may in no sort be annexed to the service of our God, the Crosse in Baptisme ought necessarily, to be crossed, and cursed out of our Leiturgie.

Answer.

This is that, you haue all this while houered about, & yet can finde no fit *Medius terminus* to conclude. For how wil these two propositions hang together?

The signe of the Crosse in the Church of Rome is an Idol, (which hath bin the only thing you haue proved in the former section.) Ergo:

The consignation of the Crosse in Baptisme, vsed in the Church of England, must needs be crossed and cursed out of our Leiturgie?

You vndertake to leap too far at once, there are many bankes in your way: you must proue, *first* that the signe of the Crosse in Baptisme, in the Church of Rome, is an *Idoll*, which is not granted. *Secondly*, you must proue, that *our* Crosse, and *their* Crosse in Baptisme is al one, in *number, nature, vse & estimation*: you must *lastly* proue, that we may not *lawfully* redeeme, an *ancient Ceremony*, out of his *abuse*, nor restore him, to his *auuncient lawfull vse againe*: al which, I feare, or any of them, wil be too hard a
task

raske for you to vndertake, but your present argument is this.

The Idoll of the Church of Rome, may in no sort bee annexed to the service of our God, but must be crossed, & cursed out of our Lesturgie.

But the signe of the Crosse in Baptisme, is an Idoll of the Church of Rome. Ergo:

The consignation of the Crosse in Baptisme, in the Church of England, must be crossed and cursed out of our Lesturgie.

The *Maior* is granted. The *Minor* is denied; for first, as was saide before, you will not bee able to proue, that their immateriall consignation with the Crosse in Baptisme, was ever made an Idol: and if you chance so to do, yet sure I am you wil never proue, our consignation of the Crosse in Baptisme, to haue bin an *Idoll* of the Church of Rome; your conclusion therfore, and your premisses are so faire a lunder, that they wil never bee reconciled. It seemes your crossing and cursing hath lighted vpon your owne conclusions, they are so cursedly crossed, and crossedly cursed, that they conclude nothing plainelie and directlie.

Treatise. 6. Sect.

Neither is it sufficient to say that the Crosse amongst vs, is neq; numero, neq; vsu, the same that theirs is, and though theirs be an Idoll, yet ours is not. For when God commanded his people, to breake downe the Images of the heathen, and to extinguish the very name of the, had they performed that charge, if they had burnt all the Idols of Canaan, and after ward made new of the same forme, and to another vse, though not Idolatrous, yet religious? Or how haue we discharged our duties, and shewed our detestation

of that filth by Idolatry, if having defaced all the Popish Crucifixes, and Idols, we erect them new in our Church, though not to worship them, yet to any other holy use what soever?

Answer.

If this be not a sufficient answer, then you may make it more sufficient by adding *neg. estimatione, neg. opinione religionis*, as hath beene taught you before; But why is this reason vnsufficient? Your reason is, *For when God commanded, &c.* To your first demaunde I answer, no. And yet that toucheth vs not. The things compared are nothing like. They should haue destroyed the olde Idols, and not haue made new: we make no newe Idoll, but restore an ancient Ceremony of the church, to his first integrity: which we take we may lawfully doe.

To your second I answer likewise, That we erect no new Popish Crucifixes, and Idols in our Church, but restore an ancient constitution of the Church, to the reuerend use of the consignation of the Crosse in Baptisme: Not to worship it, nor yet to ascribe virtue vnto it, as you would suggest, but to be a Ceremony of Decency, & Order, agreeable to so holy, and religious a Sacrament.

Treatise. 7. Sect.

It is true, that our Crosse, and theirs is the same both in name, & forme, but not in use, for then were it Idolatrous; Now I doe not say that the Church of England doth commit Idolatry: but that it ought to abstaine, not only from the Idolatry, or worship, but euen from all religious use, of such humane ordinances, and inuentions, which others haue, & doe Idolatrously adore; For, if to erect Crucifixes, and other Popish Images for holy use, be (contrary to the Commandement) a keeping of an honorable memory of the Idoll, how can the religious use of the Crosse in Baptisme, being as
well

well an Idoll, as any of their Images, be retained without breach of the Law: Babes keep your selues from Jdols?

Answer.

It is true, that our Crosse & theirs is the same in *name*, but neither in *forme*, nor *religious vse* altogether. I saie altogether, because in *some religious vse*, ours and theirs is the *same*: namely in this, that both they, and wee vse it for an *outwarde Ceremony*, to testifie that the *childe* shall not be ashamed, to confesse the faith of Christ crucified: their *superstitious* vse we admit not, and their *Idolatrous* vse (which I wonder how you doe distinguish from their *superstitious* vse) you free vs from. But you say, we ought to abstaine, not only from the *Idolatry*, or *worship*, but even from all *religious vse*, of such humane ordinances, as others doe *Idolatrously* adore. From the *Idolatry* I confesse, but not from that *religious vse*, which is good, and tendeth to a good end. That it is a *humane ordinance*, hindereth not, because being withal, an *Ecclesiasticall Constitution*, it is thereby made in part *divine*. That they vse it some way *superstitiously*, is no reason, why we should not cōcur with them in that wherein they vse it wel. For, *Quis Aug. de do. 9.*
quis bonus, verusq; Christianus est; Domini sui esse intel. christ. li. 2. c. 18.
ligit, ubicunq; inuenerit, veritatem.

The erecting of *Crucifixes*, and other *Popish Images*, for *holy vse*, is indeede a keeping of an *honorable memory* of the *Jdol*, & yet the wel vsing of the signe of the Crosse in Baptisme, in *our Church*, is not so. For neither doth *our Church* propose it as an *Idoll*, but as a *Ceremonie* of *decencie*, and *Order*, fit for a sacred *Action*: neither doth it propose it as a *remembrance* of *Popish Idolatry*, as you would imply, but as an *outward testimony* of our profession, and as a *memorative signe*, to put vs in minde of our Christian
duc.

duetic: which may make vs rather detest, then religiously remeber the abuses of *Popery*. And therefore neither is it aswell an *Idol*, as any of their *Images*, which you will not proue in hast: nor a *breach* of the *Apostles exhortation*, *Babes keepe your selues from Idols*.

Now we come to the *third* general part of this *Treatise*, wherein the *Treatiser* endeoureth to answer certaine objections of ours, in defence of the *Crosse*: Our *first objection* he setteth downe in these words.

The first objection. 8. Sect.

The signe of the Crosse in the first institution was free from superstition and Idolatrie: and if the abuse which grewe after be remoued, why should it not recouer his ancient vse, and indifferency, like as the bread in the Lords supper, which the Papists do religiously adore?

The Treatisers answer to the objection.

There is great difference &c.

I expected the *Treatiser* in his answer to our objections, framed by himselfe, would haue made every thinge plaine and euident: so as a man at the first sight, might perceauie the answer fitted and applied to the *objection* in every point: But some thing there was: either hast, or Ignorance, not knowing how to answer, or *Conscientia fraudis*, or I knowe not what, that would not suffer him to speake directly, nor to exemplifie his allegations, but make him wind himselfe every way, and so to double, & huddle things together, that my selfe I confesse, and I beleue few men else, can find in him, *Quid cui respondeatur*, what is answered vnto which; as to any man that diligently marketh, what he saith to the *first objection*, may plainly appeare. By which meanes, though he hath put me to a double labour, yet I will endeuor in my Replie,
both

both to fitt his *answers* to the *objection*, and make them stronger; so, that the indifferent Reader shall perceave, that no wrong is offered him; and yet with all I wil so discover his shifts, & windings, as al mē I hope, that come not with that obstinate resolution of, *Non persuadebis etiamsi per suaseris*, shall rest fully satisfied, & contented. Now therefore to his answer.

His answer consisteth of *three parts*. The *first* wherof is of those differences, which are betweene that, which God hath *created*, and *commanded*, and that which man hath *ordained*: whereby he would imple, as I take it, that the reason is not like, why the Crosse recovered out of the abuse, should returne to his *ancient integrity*; & why the *bread* in the *Lords supper*, reclaimed from *Papish adoration* should be againe restored to his *right vse*.

The *second* part of his answer, is of a *double vse* of the *Crosse*: *Civill* and *Religious*, whereby he would imply, as I thinke, that the *civill* vse may be restored to his *ancient indifferency*, but the *religious* vse cannot.

The *third* part of his answer, is concerning our *abusing* of the sign of the Crosse, in the Church of *England*, who, he saith, retaine it among vs with *opinion* very *superstitious*, and *erroneous*; and vse it otherwise, then the *ancient fathers* did: Each of these I will consider by it selfe, in their severall order: The *first* therefore hee delivereth in these words.

Treatisers answer to the 1. Obiect.

There is great difference betweene that which God hath created, and commanded, and that which Man hath ordained; for the one is necessary, and no abuse can alter the nature of it; the other indifferent, and by abuse may become unlawfull: and therefore Hezechia did worthily breake

H

the

De ceron. mil.

the braſen Serpent, not ſeeking to redreſſe the abuſe of it: Nowe howſoever Bellarmine would inſinuate, that the Croſſe is founded on Scripture, yet the weaknes of his arguments, doe bewray the unſoundnes of the matter; & therefore Tertullians indgment, is to be preferred, which plainly ſaith, that there is no warrant in Scripture for it; Horum inquit, ſilegem poſtules, ſcripturam nullam invenies, traditio tibi præſentitur auctrix, conſuetudo confirmatrix, fides obſervatrix.

Replie to the Treatiſers anſwere.

Here Joblerue, firſt your aſſertion, that there is great difference, betweene that which God hath created, & commanded, and that which man hath ordained.

Secondly, your prooſe of this difference, by theſe particulars.

1 That which God hath commanded is neceſſary, as the bread in the ſupper. of this nature are Churches, Pulpits, &c. things of neceſſarie uſe, and warranted by God himſelfe.

That which man hath ordained is indifferent, as the Croſſe in Baptiſme.

2 No abuſe can alter the nature of that, which God hath commanded, and is neceſſary: as the bread in the ſupper, Churches, Pulpits, &c. That which mā hath ordained, and is indifferent, may by abuſe become unlawful; as the retaining the braſen Serpent, which was no where commanded.

3 That which God hath commanded, is warranted by the ſcriptures.

That which man hath ordained, is not warranted in the ſcripture.

For howſoever Bellarmine would inſinuate, &c. yet you

you preferre *Tertullians* iudgement, who saith, *Traditio tibi praeauditur auctrix, &c.*

If this bee not your meaning, in the *first* part of your answer, I confesse, I cannot attaine vnto it: your words are so *intricate*, & *doubtfully* let downe; which hath caused me to vse the helpe of your *margent*, for the better vnderstanding of your *text*.

For reple therfore vnto this your *assertion*, we willingly acknowledg, that there is indeed great *difference*, betwene that which God hath *created*, & commanded: and that which *man*, as *man*, hath *ordained*: for the *first* proceedeth frō the clear fountaine of al goodnes, wifdōe, and truth: the *latter* from the corrupt fountaine of mans hart; wherein *naturally* is nothing, but *wickednes ignorāce*, and falshood: But if you make your *comparison*, betwene that which God hath *commanded*, & that which the Church of God hath *ordained*, (as in reason you ought to doe) the *difference* is not so great, as you would haue it; Let Gods *commandement* haue worthely the *first* place, and preheminance in al things, as is meete; but let the *ordinances* of the Church, be *immediatly subordinate* vnto Gods *commandement*, and ranged in a second place: not only because the Church of God heareth his *voice*; but also because she is ruled by his *spirit*: and by the *great*, and *precious promises* of God, is made partaker of the *diuine nature*: which no doubt doth assist them, euen in the *lawes* also, and *constitutions*, which are made for *Order & Decency* in the Church. 2. Pet. 1. 4.

Concerning your *first* prooffe, & point of difference, when you say, *That which God hath commanded is necessary, that which man ordained is indifferent*; I grant, that which God hath *commanded* is indeed *necessary*, for the

Beza ep. 2. circa
mod.

matter, and *necessary* for the *forme*: (wherein yet looke vpon the second Epistle of M^r. Beza. How far it is necessary to be done *as he hath commanded*:) *necessary* to be *reclaimed* from all *abuses*, that it hath bin subiect vnto: and *necessary* to be *restored* to his *first* and *true use*. But before we grant you your *second* proposition. *That which man hath ordained is indifferent*: we must be instructed, what you meane by this worde *indifferent*: for if you vnderstand, the *things them selues*, *as they are of themselves*, we grant that the Church cannot make a thing *indifferent*, to be of it *selfe*, other then a thing *indifferent*: but if you vnderstand the *same things*, *as they are for use*, lawfully *commanded*, or *forbidden*, by the authority of the Church, then we must tel you, that it is not *freely* in your owne power, and *liberty*, whether you will *use* them, or *not use* them *accordingly*: for then they cease to be *altogether indifferent*, & beginn to become *some way necessary*: which that you may the rather beleeue, I will direct you to M^r. Bezaes 24. Epistle, where you may learne it.

Beza ep. 24. ad
3. 6. 7. & 8.

Res aliqui per se mediae (saith he) *mutant quodammodo naturam, cum a quo legitimum mandato, vel precipiuntur, vel prohibentur; quia neq. contra iustum preceptum omitti possunt, si precipiantur, neq. contra interdictum fieri, si prohibeantur.*

Things otherwise of them selues indifferent, change their nature after a sort, when they are either comanded, or forbidden, by anie lawfull authority: because they can neither be omitted, contrary to the iust precept, if they be commanded; nor done contrary to the prohibition, if they be forbidden. And a litle after.

Ibid. nn. 9.

Nam et si conscientias proprie solus Deus ligat: tamen quatenus Ecclesia, ordinis & decori, adeoq. edificationis ratione

*tionem habens, leges aliquas de rebus medijs ritè condit, e-
iusmodi leges pijs omnibus sunt obseruande, & eatenus cō-
scientias ligant, ut nemo sciens & prudens, rebellandi a-
nimo, possit absq; peccato, vel facere quæ ita prohibentur,
vel omitttere quæ sic præcipiuntur.*

For though God only doth properly bind the consciences:
yet so far forth as the Church, hauing regard of order, de-
cency, and adification, maketh rightly any lawes, cōcern-
ing things: *indifferent*: those lawes are to be obserued, by
al godly men, and so far bind the consciences, that no man
wittingly, and willingly, with a purpose of rebelling, may
without sinne, either doe those things which are so forbid-
den, or omit those things, which are so commanded.

I pray you M^r Treatiser, marke diligently the words,
*conscientias ligant, or, nemo sciens & prudens rebellandi
animo, possit absq; peccato*: for you knowe how many of
your biethren, are forgetfull of this instruction: without
sinne, say you, what sinne I pray you? I referre you for an-
swere to an other. *Qui violat Ecclesiasticam politiam. pec-
cat multis modis: primum enim reus fit violatè ordinis in
Ecclesia: deinde auctoritatem Magistratus contemnit: tū
infirmorum conscientias vulnerat: postremo nocet exem-
plo: & charitatem erga fratres violat.*

*Hemmingius
in Syrag. cap.
de adiphonā 2*

He that breakes the Ecclesiasticall Policie, sinneth ma-
ny waies: first hee is guilty of breaking the orders of the
Church: secondly he contemneth the authority of the Ma-
gistrates: thirdly, hee woundeth the consciences of the
weake: and lastly he hurteth by example, & violateth the
law of Charitie.

Againe whereas speaking of things necessary, in your
margin you giue vs to vnderstād, that of this nature are
Churches, Pulpits, &c. I demand, of what nature? meane

you of the *same nature*, that the *bread* in the *supper* is: for so the purport of your answer seemeth to imply, that being only urged in the obiection. If this be your meaning, you are very much mistaken: for though *Churches* and *Pulpits*, are very *necessary* in deed, in *their kinde*: yet their *necessity* is not of that *nature*, that the *bread* in the *supper* is of. For the *bread* in the *supper*, is *simply*, and *absolutely necessary*, in so much that if there be *no bread*, there is no *Sacrament*: but *Churches*, and *Pulpits* are only *necessary* for *conveniency*, and *decency*: for I hope, those *Catus antelucani*, *ad canendum Christo & Deo*, meetings in the morning to sing to Christ, and God, as *Tertullian* speaketh, frequented by the *Christians*, in the time of *persecution*, were grateful vnto God, though not done in *Churches*. and those *verba propositi exhortatoria, ad imitationem honestarum rerum*, words of the *Provost*, wherewith he exhorted to the imitation of so honest things, which *Iustine Martyr* mentioneth, may be esteemed good *sermons*, though not deliuered out of *Pulpits*. To conclude this point, if *Churches* be of the *same nature* for *necessity*, that the *bread* in the *supper* is, how hath it of late yeares come to passe, that many of your brotherhooode, in the *freedom* of *Christian religion*, haue made choice of *private houses* for their *sermons*, rather then of *Churches*: & of the end of a *table* in a *Gentlemans parlour*, rather then of a *Pulpit*? These your practises haue made prooffe vnto the world, that *Churches*, and *Pulpits*, howsoever *necessary*, are not yet so *necessary*, even in your owne opinion, as the *bread* in the *supper*: nor so greatly respected by you, as here you would make vs now beleue.

Your *second* point of difference, betweene things *commanded* by God, and *ordained* by man is, *No abuse can alter*

Tert. Apol. c. 2.

Iust. Mart. Apol. 2. non lodge à sine.

ter

ter the nature of that, which God hath commanded, but that which man hath ordained, may by abuſe become unlawful: as the retaining the braſen Serpēt, which you note in the margent, was no where commanded, and therefore Hezechia did worthily breake it, not ſeeking to redreſſe the abuſe of it.

In the *firſt* of theſe propoſitions. *No abuſe can alter the nature of that, which God hath commanded.* I confeſſe I do rather gueſſe, then wel vnderſtand what you meane by altering of the nature: I ſuppoſe your meaning to be this, viz. that *no abuſe* faſtened by *Papiſts*, vpon the bread in the ſupper, can ſo alter the *right uſe* thereof, but that by the *Orthodox* and right *belcevers*, it may againe be reduced to his *firſt integrity*: we concur with you in this opinion, & thinke the very ſame in the ſigne of the Croſſe: No, ſay you, not ſo, *becauſe that which mā hath ordained may by abuſe become unlawfull*: this we confeſſe alſo, but adde, that by right uſe, it may againe alſo become lawful: for what ſhould hinder it? Becauſe, ſay you, it is *ordained by man*. ſo then the *point of difference* conſiſteth in the *diuerſity* of the *Authors*: the bread abuſed may againe be *rightly uſed*, becauſe God is the *author* of that inſtitution: the Croſſe in Baptiſme once *abuſed*, can never againe be *rightly uſed*, becauſe man is the *ordainer* thereof: God and man doe differ, *tanquam creator & creatura*: betweene whom Chriſt being both God and man, is *medius*, *medius*: betweene God I ſay, on the one ſide, & all *mankinde* on the other: but to bring them yet a great deale nearer, God & *faithful man*, regenerated by the *ſpirit* of God (of which ſort is the Church and every true member thereof) doe differ, *tanquam pater & filius*, as the father & the ſonne, *I will bee a father vnto you, and yee ſhall bee my ſonnes and* Ier. 3. 1.
daugh-

a. Cor. 6. 18.
Eph. 3. 22.

Rom. 8. 7.

daughters, betweene whom *Christ* in both *natures*, is, *Magister*, a mediator, or reconciler, to take away that difference, which was betweene *them*, and *us*, that wee might be the habitation of *God* by the *spirit*: So that these, as you see, differ only as *relatiues*, whose difference is, their *naturall* reciprocation, and whose *dinexsitie* is their *coniunctiō*: the one not crossing, but referring it selfe vnto the other: Only *God* and *unregenerate men*, differ, *tangquam hostes*, like opposites, for *ἐσθνμα ὀχλός* that liueth in them, is *enmity* with *God*, as the Apostle teacheth: so that, except you wil say, that *unregenerate* and *wicked man*, is the ordainer of the *Crosse*, as you doe fallly, when you say it is, the inuention of *Antichrist*, the man of sin (for by your owne confession, it is more auncient then he) you see there is no such great difference between the bread in the supper, and the *Crosse* in *Baptisme*, *ex parte auctoris*, in respect of the authors. The one being the ordinance of *God*, the other of the Church of *God*, which heareth his voice, & is guided by his *spirit*: the one being the ordinance of *God*, the other of the faithfull, the obedient *Children* & *sons* of *God*: as partly before hath bin declared. I supposed rather, that you would haue made the difference to consist, in the *dinexsitie* of the pollutions, which each of them in the time of their abuse had contracted. The bread, a pollution indeed, but easely separable, & remouable from it againe: The *Crosse* such a pollution, or filth, as afterwards you please to call it, as no water can cleanse it, nor any pretence purifie it, for the holy seruice of *Iehoua*. But because you vse these *florishes*, in the next sectiō, I wil spare to speake of it, til I meet you there.

Thirdly you presse vs with the example of *Hezekiah*. The brazen serpent, say you, though commanded by *God*
him.

himſelfe, yet retained without his expreſſe cōmandement, became an Idoll, and was therefore worthily broken of Hezekiah, not ſeeking to reforme the abuſe, Therefore much more the Croſſe in Baptiſme, which was ordained by man only, being abuſed in as high a degree of Idolatry, as the braſen Serpent was, is utterly to be deſtroied, without any farther redreſſe. This is the, *nodus Gordius*, & height of al your objections, your fortrefſe, & bulwarke, your *Herculeū & Achillean argumentum*, wherein you repoſe all your ſtrength and greateſt confidence: and therefore I wil indeuor, ſo to ſir mine anſwere, to euery point therof, as I truſt the indifferent reader, ſhal eaſely perceauē your weakneſſe, euen in the miſt of al your ſtrength:

Therefore concerning your *compariſon*, betwene the reformation of Ezechiah, and our *Gouernors*, I anſwere, firſt in this example, we muſt put a difference, betweene thoſe things that are common therein and left for example of *imitatio* to other men, and thoſe things which are proper, and peculiar to this action: The things common to all good reformers, and left to others for example of *imitation*, are theſe.

First the duty of a Kinge & cheife Magiſtrate, on whom it lieth to reforme abuſes, and without whole authority, no priuat man is to aſſume that office, vnto himſelfe: *Rex domino aliter ſeruit quia homo eſt, aliter quia etiam et Rex eſt: quia homo eſt, et ſeruit viuendo fideliter quia etiam Rex, ei ſeruit, cum ea facit ad ſeruendum illi, quae non poteſt facere, niſi Rex.* which I note the rather to put our Treatiſer, and his adherents, in minde of their too much forwardneſſe, to begin reformation, being but priuat perſons, and to put it in practice, without commiſſion. *Nemo hanc auctoritatem ſibi ſumere debet, ut conſtituat aliquem ordinem in Eccleſia, niſi ſit ad hoc diuinitus vocatus, & habeat auctoritatem*

Aug. epi. 50. ad
Bonif. comitem.

Bucer. in ſcript.
Angl. pag. 154.

Wolphius in
hunc locum.

toritatem publicam, & consensum Ecclesia, Priuatis hominibus, ut hoc agant, pius et sapiens autor est nemo. Those priuat men, that are thus busy, had neither piety nor wisdom, to giue the counsell for so doing. *Secondly* His zeale in Gods cause, which was most feruent, & such it ought to be, in al good *Gouernors*, and *reformers*. *Thirdly* his reformation in repressing Idolatry, & taking away the occasion therof. *Fourthly* that together with his reformatiō, he ioined instruction, & teaching of the people: for whē hee saw them to repose a power of healing, in the brasen Serpent, he called it *Nehustan*, & shewing the matter, taught them that it had no such power in it; and was nothing but a lump of brasse: al these things, I doubt not, but that our reformers proposed vnto themselves, for an example of reformation.

The things proper to this action, and hauing peculiar reference, after a sorte, to the person of *Hezekiah* were first his manner of reformation, by breaking the brasen Serpent in peeces, & vtterly annihilating of it: *Secondly* the particular motives that might induce him, to this reformatiō, namely one inward, being extraordinarily moved therevnto by the spirit of God, which doth appear in this, that hee did otherwise reforme it, then his religious predecessors before him had done. Another outward being occasioned so to do because *Achaz* his father, had either himselfe brought this superstitiō into his kingdom, or else being brought in formerly, by his Predecessors, had by his examples, and authority. giuen great furtherance, and encouragement thervnto; and therefore, vtterly to take away that staine wherwith *Achaz* had stained the house and stock of *Dauid*, *Hezekiah*, no doubt, was the rather induced to this destroying kind, and manner of reformation.

Now if our Predecessors, and Reformers followed him
not,

not, in this manner of *reforming*, by vtter *subuersiō*, they had great *reason* so to do, being men, whom neither the *abuses* might so particularly concerne, as this did *Hezekiah*, and knowing moreover, that, *Ad eundem finem multis medijs peruenitur*. Reformation of abuses, & taking away of *Idolatri* is the *end*, and this *end* may be attained by more waies then on, as either, by

Instructing the people, and teaching them the *right use*: or by *Lawes* prohibiting the *Idolatri*: or by *punishments*, either *penall*, or *capitall*, vpon the transgressors of the lawes established: or by *removing* the *thing* (if it be a *materiall* thing, as this was) out of the *places* of resort, into some *secluse* place, vvhether the people might neither come at it, nor see it, and where *without offence* it might still be kept, for a *monument* of Gods mercy: or lastly, if nothing else wil serue, by vtter *abolishing*, and destroying the thing. Nowe because, of all these waies, hee made choice of that, which he iudged, and which was indeed, the most *expedite*, and *ready way*, and withal the *surest*, that *Idolatri* might never be cōmitted to it againe; (*Religiosa potestate Deo seruiens, cum magna pietatis laude contriuit*) doing God service, with his *religious authority*, he brake it, and is worthily commended for his *piety*.

Aug. de ciuit.
Dei lib. 10. c. 8.

If it had seemed good in his iudgement, to haue taken some of the other courtes, as it is likely, *David & Asa, & Iehosaphat*, and other good kings of *Iuda* before him did, his cōmendations, as theirs, had bin no whit lesse, though his *reformatiō* had neither bin so *expedite*, nor so *sure* for time to come: for which cause also, that great & famous execution, which *K. Henrie the eight* did vpon the *Monestaries* of this Land, is likewise commended: yet *manie* both *zealous*, and *religious* professors, could rather haue wished, that so many famous *Monuments*, erected some-

time to the *service* of God, but then *abused* by the wicked and *sinfull inhabitants*, might stil haue retained the *end*: and *punishment* haue lighted only on the *offenders*.

Yea but you will say, where the *abuses* could not otherwise be redressed; but had it remained stil *unbroken*, it would stil haue bin a *stumbling blocke*, and *occasion* of *Idolatry*, there the *readiest*, and *surest* way was to be takē: I grant where the *abuse* could not otherwise be redressed as in the *brazen Serpent*, &c. but where the *abuse* may otherwise be redressed, as in the *signe* of the *Crosse*, there *destruction*, & *viter subuersion*, is not alwaies the best *cure*. And herein plainly is the *difference*, betweene the *brazen Serpent*, and the *Crosse*. Hezekiah law the *abuse* of the *Serpent*; otherwise incurable, for vnto those daies (saith the scripture) the *children* of *Israel*, did burne *incense* vnto it: vnto those daies, importeth a long time before, and an *inevitable abuse*, that had long continued; wherein (as we are in al good reason to conceiue) the former godly kings, *David*, *Asa*, and *Iehosaphat*, who are greatly commēded, for their *reformatiōs*, had nō doubt made triall of al other meanes, and yet *experience* made *prooffe*, that by *al those* it could not be redressed. In which case Hezekiahs *courle* was *necessary*, and, *hoc supposito*, the *rule* of *Pope Stephen* holdeth. *Per hoc, magna auctoritas ista est habenda in Ecclesia, ut si nonnulli ex predecessoris. & maioribus nostris, fecerunt aliqua, quæ illotempore potuerunt esse sine culpa, & postea vertuntur in errorē & superstitionem: sine tarditate aliqua, & cum magna auctoritate, à posteris destruantur*. For this cause this *authority* is to be esteemed great, in the *Church*, that if some of our *predecessors*, & *ancestors*, haue done *scmthings*, which at *that time*, might be without *fault*, and afterwards are

tur-

2 King. 18. 4.

Dist 63. cap.
Quia Sancta.

turned into error, and *superstition*, they may be destroyed by posteritie, without all *lingring*, and with great *authority*. Our Church contrarywise perceiveth, by the fruitfull experience, now of almost fifty yeares, that the abuse, of the consignatiō of the Crosse in Baptisme, is curable, where obedient, and conformable Teachers, instruct the people a right. & it seemeth further, that this abuse, wold haue bin much more redressed before these daies, had not the Treatiser, and his complices hindered the worke, by their untrue slanders, and accusations, both of our Church, as retaining the reliques of Popery, and of the thing, as if it were the marke of the beast, & framed in the forge of Antichrist; which they know to haue bin, a decent Ceremony vsed in the purest age, and by the greatest pillars of the Church, long before any shew of Antichrist did appear.

Againe Janswere, that it is by the Magistrates, to be considered. First, wherein the abuse doth more principally reside; whether in the persons, that do abuse the thing, or in the thing that is abused. For reason would generally, that as by the skilfull Physician, cures are applied to those parts, that are most affected, so by the discreet Magistrate, the redresse should be made there, where the abuse principally consisteth. If in the persons, the easines, or difficulty, of reforming them, is diligently to be respected. If in the thing that is abused, the Magistrate is likewise to consider, of what nature the thing is. If evill of his owne nature, and first institution, as *Lupanaria*, the *Stews* and such like places be, then without al questiō, their best redresse is, their vtter subversion, and destruction. If good of his owne nature, & first institution, but abused by mē, as both the *brazen Serpent*, & the sign of the Crosse were: then the consideratiō is, whether the thing thus abused,

be *such*, as may wel be spared, or *such* as cannot wel bee spared. If so, then it is apparantly, the readier, and easier way, to take away the thing. If otherwise, then the wisdō of the Magistrate, wil direct him, rather to take away the *abuse*, then destroy the *thing*. These cōsiderations in the matter of the *brazen Serpēt*, made good king *Hezechiah* to finde, that the *brazen Serpēt* was for one peculiar time & occasion, that it had long before his daies performed that service, for which it was erected, that it belonged not to the people of his time, nor had no such cure, as before, to effect: That though the *Serpent* were a type of the *Messiah*, yet there remained a memory of it in the bookes of *Moses*, that would serue that turne, though this were taken away. Lastly, that it was *all one*, these things considered, whether it were preserved still, or vtterly abolished: vpon which grounds, he proceeded, to that, so much cōmended *execution*, brake it in peeces, and called it, *Nehushtan*. The same deliberations likewise, in our reformers, in the matter of the *Crosse*, made them to find, that the consignation of the *Crosse* in *Baptisme*, was not more peculiar to the times of the *Primitive Church*, then to ours: That it had not performed all that service, for the which, it was first instituted. That it is an admonisher, as necessary now, against *Atheists*, *Mockers*, and *Blasphemers*, as it was at the first, against *heathen*, and *Pagan Idolators*. That if it were taken away, the Church of *Rome*, might iustly accule vs, of *abrogating* an *harmelese*, & *in-*

*Non temere,
nec subinde, nec
levibus de cau-
sis ad novatio-
nem est decurre-
dum. (Citr. Inst.
lib. 4. cap. 10.)*

nocent institution, of the *Primitive Church*. That it is not indifferent to our Church, whether it bee taken away, or not: both because we are not to *reiect* ancient *institutions*, where there is no neede, and also to make knowne to the *Romanists*, that we willingly *reiect* nothing, that possible may

may be reduced, to his *first integritie*. Vpon these grounds and deliberations, our good Magistrates in *K. Edwardes daies*, did not abolish the *use* of the *Crosse* in *Baptisme*. And vpon the same grounds our *worthy Prince, & Magistrates*, that now are, thinke it meete, to *retaine* it still. *Quid hic peccatum est?* what offence I pray you is this? or why should not you be as fauourable to our *Christian* Beza Respon. ad Franc. Baldvini pag. 227. liberty herein, as the most learned Mr. Beza is? *Scio non nullos sublata crucis adoratione, aliquem signi crucis usum retinuisse; ut antur igitur ipsi, sicut par est, sua libertate.*

I answered *thirdly* that our *Reformers* did the *same thing*, in their *reformation*, of the *Crosse* in *Baptisme*, which *Ezekiah* did in his *reformation* of the *Brasen Serpent*: for what was that, which *Hezekiah* did? surely it was, that he tooke away the *abuse*, wherein it was *faulty*, not the *right use*, wherein it was *typicall*, and *figuratiue*. The *abuse* wherein it was *faulty*, was the *burning* of *Incense* vnto it, and *worshipping* of it, & the *occasion* of this *abuse* was, that *opinion*, and *estimation* of *Deity*, which the people had *falsly* affixed vnto it: both the *e* he tooke away; namely the *abuse*, and the *occasion*. Our *reformers* haue done the very same; They haue taken away, *first*, the *abuse* of the *signe* of the *Crosse* in *Baptisme*; which was, the too great *estimation*, and *opinion*, of *grace*, *power* and *vertue*, that the people *erroniously* reposed in it: and *secondly*, the *occasion* of that *abuse*; which was the *ignorance*, and *misunderstanding* of the people, for want of *instruction*.

Only the *difference* is: that the *abuse* which was the *least*, in the *Idolatrous Iewes*; namely their *false opinion* of *Deity* in the *Serpent*, was the *greatest* in our men, as touching the *Crosse*: and that which was the *greatest* in them;

them; namely their *worshipping*, and *burning incense*, vnto the *Serpent*, was none at all in ours, in the *signe* of the *Crosse*. For our *men*, going as far as *they*, in ascribing *vertue*, which was an *equal fault* in both, could not go so far in *worshipping*, & *adoring*, becaule of the *diuersity* of the *natures*, of the *seuerall things*. The *braſen Serpent*, being a *subſtance materiall*, and *permanent*, and therefore *eaſely ſubiect* to *adoration*, by reason of the *outward ſhape*, and *forme*: The *ſigne* of the *Crosse* an *action immateriall*, and *transient*, & therefore nothing ſo *eaſely*, to be *worſhipped*, by reason it wanted both *ſubſtance*, *ſhape*, and *forme*.

Secondly *Hezekiah*, neither tooke away, nor purpoſed to take away, the *right uſe* of the *ſerpent*, wherein it was not *faulty*; namely, that it was a *type*, of *Chriſts exaltatiō*, on the *Crosse*, and therein a *representation*, of the *Meſſiah*: This uſe remained ſtill, after the *reformation* of *Hezekiah*: Neither did our *Gouernors*, take away that *uſe*, of the *ſigne*, of the *Crosse*, wherein it was not *faulty*: Neither did they ſuppoſe it *meet*, to take it away: but *reſtoring* it to that *uſe*, for which it was *inſtituted* at the *firſt*, left it ſtill to be a *memoratiue ſigne*, of our *promiſe* made to *Chriſt* in *Baptiſme*, and a *ſecret*, and *faithfull admoniſher* of our *duties*. So that we may ſafely ſay, our *Reformers* followed the *reformation* of *Hezekiah*, moſt *exactly* in all points, wherein the *diuers natures* of the *abuses*, & the *things*, did not make a *neceſſary difference* of their *reformation*.

Concerning your comparing of the *authors*: The *braſen Serpent* commanded by *God*, and the *Crosse* in *Baptiſme* ordained by *man*, though I haue answered thereto before, this now I add moreover, by way of retortion: Though both did giue *occaſion* to *Idolatry*, yet the *braſen Serpent*, even therefore, becaule it was ordained by
God,

God, might minister a more *probable, present, and obvious* fall into *Idolatri*, then the *Crosse in Baptisme*, in that it was *ordained* by man: This I declare thus.

When mens minds are once *infected* with *superstition*, they take holde *soonest* of that, which is most commended by the *author*: & the more *worthy* the author is, the more *firme*ly they cleave to that, which they have once fastned their *error* vppon. if therefore they finde *God* to be the *author* of it, they take that for reason *sufficient*, why they should *worship* it. This cause made the *Idolatrous* *Ities*, not only to *worship* the *braſen Serpent* at the first; but also to thinke, that in so doing they *did well*; because they *worshipped only that*, wherof they knewe certainly, *God* himselfe to be the *author*. The same reason moued those *Idolators*, reprobued by the Prophet, *to burne incense to the Sunne, and Moone, and all the host of heauen*, and to *worship* the, thinking their *Idolatri* the more *iustificable*, because it tooke *occasion*, not vppon any *invention* of man, but vppon those excellent *creatures* of *God*, whom hee hath placed so high, and adorned with so great beauty: Contrariwise, the *deuises* and *inventions* of men, such as the *Crosse* is, are alwayes *doubtfull*, and *suspected*, euen vnto the *Idolators* themselves; and haue not their *occasion*, so *present, & immediate*, as the other: For first, the *Author* must haue some *reason* for his deuile, and then authority, to giue *countenance* therunto: and lastly, the *opinion* of the people, approving the *reason*, & imbracing the *authority*. which points being wel considered, as they make a farther way about, to bring the credit of *adoration*, to that which is *invented* by man: so they are good *meanes*, to perswade the people to forsake their *Idolatri*: when they haue imbraced it: So that your argu-

ment, from the *diuersity of the Authors*, doth rather make against you, then giue any strength to your cause.

The like may be said of the *opinio* of vertue, which the Idolor is alwaies willing, to ascribe vnto his *Idoll*. For when it doth manifestly appeare, that that, which he maketh an *Idoll*, is commanded of God, the Illation is farr more present and easy *Ergo*, it cannot be without vertue: then can be applied to any ordinance deuised by man.

Concerning your comparing of the *brazen Serpent*, and the *Crosse* together, wee must confesse, the Idolatrie is like, and worthy to be punished with like extirpation, so long as you cōpare, the material *brazen Serpent*, with the material Crosse, of wood, stone, brasse, or anie outward sensible substancē. For these having once gotte the opinion of *Deity*, to reside in thē, expose themselues to be adored by the vulgar sort, no lesse, and in no inferiour degree, then the Serpent did. But when you extend your comparison, to match the *immateriall* consignatiō of the Crosse in Baptisme, with the *materiall* brazen Serpent, your comparison holdeth not correspondency, as in the former. For there is great difference, betweene this *consignation*, and those other *Crosses*: so that, wherein this is different, from them, therein also it must needs bee different from the brazen Serpēt. From those other Crosses, and so consequently, from the brazen Serpent, this consignation of the Crosse in Baptisme, doth differ, *First in matter*: they *materiall*, and *sensible*, this *immateriall* & *insensible*. *Secondly*, in the *end*, they made perhaps, and framed of purpose to be *receptacles of diuine worship*, this only to serue for a *signe of remembrance*, being therefore iustly to be reckoned among those things, *Qua pertinent*

adiutaſias & ius xnuoovv; which belong to *order* and *de-*
ceacy: Because it admoniſheth the rude people of their
Bucer. in ſcrip.
Angl. pag. 454.
duty, and calleth men to a remembrance, of that obedi-
ence, that they owe to God, by a manifeſt and ſpecial ſig-
nification, wherby the Church is edified. *Thirdly*, in the
abuse, they abuſed in as high a degree of ſuperſtition, as
the Serpent was, this only abuſed in erroneous opinion,
and conceipt of *vertue*, and *power*, falſly aſcribed vnto it.
And *fourthly* in *redreſſe*, they no waies cureable, but by
demolition, this curable by *informing* the vnderſtanding
aright, & teaching the ignorant, that we reſoſe no *power*
and *vertue* in it, nor yeeld any *diuine worſhip* vnto it, but
vſe it only as an *admoniſher*, & *remembrancer* of our Chri-
ſtian duties: and therefore you muſt not argue, that be-
cause thoſe *material Croſſes* were as offenſiue as the bra-
ſen Serpent, therefore this *immateriall conſignatiō* muſt
needes be ſo. You ſhall doe better to diſtinguiſh them in
name, calling them, as they are indeede, Croſſes, and this
the *conſignation* of the Croſſe: then to confound them in
nature, or ſuffer your ſelfe to be deceived by the *name*, as
if what things ſoener agree in *name*, muſt of neceſſity a-
gree in *ſuperſtition*, and *Idolatry*.

Laſtly concerning your marginal note, that God no
where *comanded* the retaining of the braſen Serpent; we
anſwer, nether doth he any where *forbid it*: & I make no
doubt, but had it not bin abuſed to ſuperſtition, it might
without offence to God, haue bene retained, though he
gaue no expreſſe commandement ſo to do. And he that
conſiders, what great prerogatiues the braſen Serpent
had, wil (I ſuppoſe) be of the ſame opinion. For it was ere-
cted, not by *mans*, but by *Gods direct commandement*. It
was adorned and commended, with a moſt famous and

1oh. 3. 14.

memorable *miracle*: It was a monumēt of a very strāge and extraordinary *cure*: It had continued a long time, & might almost alleadge *Prescription*, why it should be retained stil: It was a type and figure of *Christ's exaltation* on the Crosse, as himselfe expoundeth it: *As Moses liſt vpon the braſen Serpent in the wildernes: ſo muſt the ſonne of man be liſted vpon, &c.*

Beza epiſt. 24.

ad 5. 6. 7. & 8.

Num. 9.

But what woulde you inferre vpon the not retaining of the braſen Serpent? That we should not retaine the vse of the Crosse in Baptiſme? But this our Church hath *enioyned*, and commanded, whose *commādemēt*, we are bound in *conſcience* to obay, ſo long as it commaundeth nothing *contrary* to the word, & will of God. For howſoever you & your conſorts reiect obedience, yet we take it not our duties ſo to doe. Lawes made by the Church, of things *indifferent* (as M^r. Beza told you a litle before) doe ſo far binde the conſcience, that no man *wittingly*, and *willingly*, and with a purpose of reſiſting (take heede M^r. Treatiſer this claue cōclude not many of your Brotherhood) may *without ſin*, either do thoſe things which are ſo forbidden, or omit thoſe things which are ſo com-

Calv. Inſt. lib.

4 c. 10. par. 6. 31

manded. *Chriſtiani populi officiū eſt* (ſaith M^r. Calvin) *que ſecundum hunc canonem (in quo charitas moderatrix eſt) fuerint inſtituta, &c.* It is the duty of Chriſtiā people to obſerue and keepe thoſe lawes that ſhal be made, according to this rule, (meaning where charity is the Moderatrix as he ſaid before) with a free conſcience indeede, and no ſuperſtition, but with a godly and readie propenſion to obedience. Neither muſt they haue them in contempt, nor by careleſſe negligence omit them: much leſſe through pride and ſtubbornneſſe openly violate and reſiſt the. Where, by the way, let it trouble no

man,

man, that M^r. Beza saith *conscientias ligant*, M^r. Calvin saith, *libera quidem conscientia*. For M^r. Beza in his binding of the conscience, hath respect vnto the obedience that is due vnto the authority, M^r Calvin in his freedome of the Conscience, hath reference to that estimation we should haue of the things, not to thinke otherwise of them then of things *indifferent*, though commanded by authority: to which purpose M^r. Bucer also speaketh, *has et si seruare & omittre etiam extra scandalum licet, tamen si ex proteruita aut petulantia quis ordinem, publica auctoritate constitutum contemnat & turbet, non leuiter peccat.* These Ceremonies though it be lawfull to obserue or omit, where no scandall is offered, yet if any man vpon frowardnes or wantonnes, shal cōtemne, or disquiet the order, that is established by publike authority, he sinneth greiuously. And let this suffice for answere to your example of the *brazen Serpent*, and second point of difference.

Bucer. in scripto.
Angl. pag. 454.

Your third point of difference I take to be, The bread in the supper, is warranted in the scripture. The Crosse in Baptisme hath no warrāt in the word. For howsoeuer Bel-larmine would insinuate, &c.

The former of these, That the bread in the supper is warranted in the Scripture, we know right wel: to the latter that the signe of the Crosse is not warranted we answere first, that it is no where in the Scripture forbidden. Secondly, *Non requiritur necessarium, ut in sacris litteris expressam mentionem exhibeamus, singulariū rerū quas v-surpamus.* Thirdly, that though in expresse words it be not warranted, yet *virtually, fundamentally*, and in *suo principio*, it is even in the Scriptures cōprehended. The principle, and foundation that I meane, is, that generall precept of the Apostle concerning things indifferent. Let

Pei. Mart. in
Ep 4. ad Hope-
perum.

1. Cor. 14. 40. *all things be done decently and in order*, in the generallity wherof this particular is contained, as by the deduction before mentioned in the answer, to the *Minor* of your maine Syllogisme, may plainly appeare; Lastly concerning *Bellarmins* insinuation, that the *Crosse* is grounded &c: we stande not vpon it, nor build our opinion vpon any prooffe of his. Yet, as it is certaine, that the *materiall* *Crosse*, wherevpon Christ suffered, was shadowed by the *pole*, whervpon the brazen Serpent was lifted vp (for so our Savior himselfe doth resemble it) so I see not what inconvenience can follow, if we should say with S^r. *Augustine*, and S^r. *Cyprian*, that evē this our *immateriall* cōsignation, did take his first beginning and occasion in the primitiue Church, vpon the signing of the Israelites *dore posts*, with the *bloud* of the *Pascall Lambe*: or by the signing of thē that mourne in their *foreheads* with the mark of the *letter T.* or by *Jacobs* blessing of *Ephraim* and *Manasses* with his *hands a crosse*, wherby as *Musculus* obserueth, *Adumbrabatur mysterium Crucis, in quo est omnis vera benedictionis fons & origo.* But al this we yeeld vnto you, and embrace with you *Tertullians* iudgement, that this is established by no other warrant, then by the *authoritie* of the *Church*, the *weight* wherof you haue sufficiently hard of before. But now let vs heare the second part of your answere, to our first obiection.

Treatise. 9. Sect.

Now it is farther to bee noted, that a double use of the *Crosse* is mentioned in antiquity: one ciuill, & the other religious, against the former wee doe not dispute, yeelding all reverence to those Christians, which by that note shewed their reioicing and glory in that, which the heathen counted their shame. But now, that abuse hath turned the *Image* and *signe* of the *Crosse*, into an *Idoll*, it seemeth thereby to be made

made execrable. For Gideons Ephod being first a ciuill monument of victorie, when the people went a whoring after it, was it lawfull for the Magistrat, to erect in the Tabernacle or Synagogue, though not the same yet the like, both in name & forme to any religious vse? Would it haue sufficed to haue said, this is not the same Ephod, that Israel maketh an Idoll of, neither is it set here to bee worshipped (for y^eur brethren doe grievously sin therein) but only to keep in minde the great victorie that God by Gedeon gaue to Israell? Right so the Crosse v^sed by the ancients to shewve that they were not ashamed of Christ crucified, being meere-ly ciuill, and yet expressing a most Christian resolution, ha-ving bin abused, yea continuing to be worshipped, both in Imagine & in Signo, It seemeth that this filth hath made it unfit, on any pretence of restoring it to his ancient vse, to be annexed to the holy things of the Sanctuary. Especial-ly while there are so many Papistes, that superstitiously a-buse it among vs. Now for the religious vse of the Crosse, by the ancients, it was never free from sin and superstition, as afterwards is shewed, and if it were, yet it being an hu-mane ordinance and now not only abused to Idolatrie, but becöming it selfe a most abominable Idoll, no water cā clese it, nor any pretext purifie it, for the holy seruice of Iehonah

Replie to the second part of the

Treatisers answere.

The Treatisers maine forces are spent already, in the first part of his answere, All these things that follow are nothing else but, *leuis armaturæ milites*, his light horsemē and florishes, to make the number of his argumentes seeme the greater. In this Section he telleth vs of a two-fold vse of the Crosse mentioned in antiquity, one *Ciuill*, the other *Religious*. this we acknowledge to be true. The

ciuill.

use was held of the, as a *Trophee*, & publike Monument, of that great victory which God gaue to *Constantine* against *Maxentius*. For which cause *Constantine*, at the first made the signe of the Crosse in his *imperiall banner*, stamped it vpon his *Cornes*, graued it in his *statues*, & *Images*, and in the armor of his Soldiers: And the like hath bin vsed by all Christian Princes ever since. *Secondly*, as an ornamēt in story, or outward beautifying of any thing: *Thirdly*, as an outward marke of distinction frō the heathen *Jdolaters*, wherby in their common meetings; and intercourse of life, they made it knowne, as well to the *Infidels*, as to one another, that they were *Christians*, & no waies ashamed of the Crosse of Christ.

Cyp. ep. ad Thimar. cap. 8.

Ter tull de coron mil. cap. 3.

The *religious* use they made of the Crosse, consisted more privatly, in a mutual reference towards theselues, and was frequented, *First* in their actions of cōmon life, still to excite their *devotion*, to admonish them of their duties, and put them in minde of Christ crucified. *Muniantur aures, ne audiant edicta feralia. Muniantur oculi ne videant detestanda simulacra. Muniantur frons, ut signū dei incolume seruetur. Muniantur os, ut dominū suū lingua victrix tueatur:* as *Cypriā* speaketh, *ad omnē progressū atq; promotū.* &c. as *Testullian* declareth, They vsed to mark their foreheads with the signe of the Crosse, at every moving, and stirring of their bodies, as they went out, as they came home, as they put on their cloathes, pulled on their shooes, and as they washed; at table, and at candle-lighting, going to bed, and sitting downe, & generally in every particular action of their life. *Secondly*, they vsed the signe of the Crosse, in the Sacramēt of Baptisme, as we doe now, for a present *admonition*, and *memorative token*, continually to put vs in minde of our duty & profession,

ſſion, which in that Sacrament we vndertake. J haue therfore the more particularly mentioned theſe differences, that J may the better expreſſe this point to the vnderſtanding of the Reader.

Concerning therfore the *ciuill* vſe of the *Croſſe*, among the Auncients, the Treatiſer deliuereth vs theſe oracles.

1 That he will not diſpute againſt the *ciuill* vſe, & yet he tells vs, that now by *abufe*, it is turned to an *Idoll*.

2 He yeelds *al* reuerence to thoſe Chriſtians, which by that note ſhewed their reioycing, and glory, in that which the Heathen counted their ſhame: Yet withall he ſaith, Jc is made execrable.

3 He ſaith, the Auncients, to ſhew that they were not aſhamed of Chriſt crucified, expreſſed therby a moſt Chriſtian reſolution: But withall he addeth, By the filth which it hath ſince contracted, it is made vnfit on any pretence to be reſtored to his auncient vſe, & to be annexed to the holy things of the Sanctuary.

Touching theſe his ſpeeches, as we willingly embrace that, wherein he commendeth the Auncients, (which is a thing very rare among that generatiō) ſo we would alſo free our ſelues, that tread only in their ſteps, and vſe it no, worſe then they did, from thoſe imputations of making it an *Idoll*, *execrable*, and a *filth*, which the Treatiſer doth lay vpon vs, if not as *Authors*, yet at the leaſt as *Abettors*.

And therfore leauing their *religious* vſe, to his place, becauſe the Treatiſer ſpeaketh theſe things only of the *Ciuill* vſe: J would faine learne, which of thoſe *Ciuil* vſes mentioned before, we haue thus greiuouſly abuſed. If he ſay the *firſt* vſe in *Banners*, *Coines*, *Statues*, *Armor* & *ſc.*

such like, or the *second*, in matter of *History*, or outward *ornament*, or beautifying of any thing, himselfe is farre more faulty, then any of vs. For of the former he hath yeelded before, that in Princes *Banners*, *Coronations*, *Coyne*, *Crownes*, or in any other *Ciuill* respect, it may haue a lawfull vse: yea, though it be apparantly an *Idoll*. And touching the latter he maketh no question, but that it may be made and retained, though it be of an *Image*, euen such an *Image* as is *Idolatrously* worshipped. Neither can I possibly see, how we haue made an *Idoll*, *ex-ecration*, and *filth* of their thirde ciuill vse, whereby they made it a *note of distinction* from the *Infidells*. For that is the very point, for the which, in this place he so commendeth the Aunrients, yeelding al reuerence to those Christians &c. & againe, They haue expresse a most Christiā resolution: &c. So that except the Treatiser haue some other *Ciuill vses*, of the Aunrients in store, that we know not of, we cannot be perswaded, that we retaine any *Ciuill vse* of theirs as an *Idoll*, *execrable*, and a *filth*, either in the *Image*, or in the *signe*.

But yet he proueth it by the example of *Gideons Ephod*. For *Gideons Ephod*, saith'hee, being first &c. I take the force of his reason to be this.

That good *ciuill vse* of any thing that is abused, and continueth to be worshipped both *in Image*, & *in signo*: is made an *Idoll*, *execrable*, and a *filth*. This he proueth by the example of *Gideons Ephod*.

But the good *ciuill vse* of the *rosse* among the Aunrients, is abused & cōtinueth to be worshipped, both *in Image* et *in signo*. This he taketh to be proued by the practise of so many Papists, as do superstitiously abuse it among vs. *Ergo*,

The

The good *civill* vse of the *Crosse* among the *Auntients* is made an *Idoll*, execrable, and a filth.

The *maior* I grant to be true, not *simpliciter*, but *secū- dum quid*: that is, only there, and among them only, that doe abuse the good *civill* vse, and continue worshipping of it, both in *Image*, and in *signo*. In them, and to them it is indeede an *Idoll*, execrable, & a filth. But what is that to others, that neither abuse it nor worshipping it? To the cleane, saith the Apostle, *all things are cleane, but to them that are defiled, and unbeleeving, nothing is cleane, but even their mindes, & consciences are defiled*. Shall the sins of one man, thinke you, be laid vpon another? God hath promised no. *Anima quæ peccaverit ipsa morietur*, The soule that sinneth that shall die; The sonne shal not beare the iniquity of the father, nether shal the father beare the iniquity of the sonne. Your perpetuall harping on one string, frō *secū dum quid*, to *simpliciter*, maketh that your musicke is nothing pleasant, as I haue tolde you often before.

Ti. 1. 19.

Ezech. 18. 20.

Touching the prooffe of your *Maior*, by the example of *Gideons Ephod*, which you say, beeing first a *civill* monument of victory, &c. I answer, that it was not only a *civill* monument, and therefore your cōparing of it with the *civill* vses of the signe of the Crosse, among the *Ancients*, is vnfit.

And that it was not only a *civill* monument, besides *S^t. Augustines* authority, the very name and nature of the *Ephod*, which he made, doth plainly teach. For what else is an *Ephod*, but that most glorious & beautifull vpper garment, which the high Priest ware in the celebration of diuine sacrifices? *Potuisse carmen ut Barac & Debora cō- scribere, vel columnam erigere aut quippiam simile*. If hee

Aug. quest. in Iudic. quest. 41

P. Mars. in 1^o 12 locum,

intended a civil monument only, whv made he choice of an Ephod? If besides the civil remembrance of his victory, he also intended the service of God (as S^r. *Augustine* indgeth) thē was it not only for a civil monument. Now that the service of God, was also in his intention, not only the name of an Ephod *Quo nomine omnia possunt intelligi, quæ constituit Gedeon in sua civitate, velut ad colendū Deum, similita tabernaculo Dei, ea locutione quæ significat à parte totum, propter excellentiam vestis Sacerdotaliū,* By which name all things may be vnderstood that Gedeon erected in his citie, as to worship God, like the tabernacle of God, by that manner of speech called *synecdoshe*, which by a part doth signifie the whole, for the excellencie of the Priests garment) but the scripture also seemeth to cōvince. For there it is said, That al Jsrael went a whooring after it. And that it was the destruction of Gedeon & his house. How could it be to his destruction if he meant it not to the service of God?

Gedeon illud Ephod Pōtificale & pretiosū nō confecit, Res. Mart.

Judg 8. 27.

August.

Gedeons sin then was, not that hee erected a civill monument only; as you saie, but, *Quod extra Dei tabernaculū, fecit aliquid simile, ubi coleretur Deus.* But becaule without the Tabernacle of God hee made some like thinges, where God should be worshipped: which was plainly against the will of God, who had appointed his worship, to bee frequented no where, but where the Arke of the Covenant was, which at that time was in *Silo*.

2. I say that there is no iust compariton betweene Gedeons Ephod, and the signe of the Crosse in Baptisme. For the end of Gedeons Ephod was, either for Gods service, (& thē it was faulty, as is said before,) & so is not the Crosse with vs: or else (to make the best of it, and to graunt you your owne interpretation) it was, that the memorie of Gods

Gods benefite towards him in his victory, might not be abolished, and then the signe, which hee vled, was not fit, nor agreeable to the matter. For, *Deus non mandauit in lege, ut fieret Ephod in istum usum, sed tantum ut sacerdotibus cum sacrificaturi essent, illud induerent: Signo igitur minus dextero, & opportuno usus est.* God did not comande in the law, that an Ephod should bee made to this vse, but only that the Priests should weare it, when they were sacrificing; wherefore hee vled a signe not so commodious, nor so fit. But our signe of the Crosse in Baptisme, is most fit, and natural, and agreeable to the actiō, to signifie the end, which we intende thereby, which is not so much to imprint a memorie of Gods benefite towards vs, as to remember & admonish our selues of that dutie, which in Baptisme wee promised vnto God.

3. To your questiō. *Vvas it lawful for the Magistrate, &c.* I may as wel aske you. Was it not lawful for the Magistrate to ro.doe? Or if that Ephod were vnlawful, was no Ephod to be vled in Gods service. afterwards?

4. As touching, that you say; *The signe of the Crosse in Baptisme, among the Ancients was meere civil*, I answer, that you haue heard before, that it was *some waie religious*, though they repoted no religion in it. For those vies that they made of it, To be a signe of their professiō of Christian religion, To bee a token that they were not ashamed of the Crosse of Christ. To be a testimony eue before Idolaters; That they put their hope & cōfidence in Christ crucified: are rather to be counted religious, in my vnderstanding, then *only and meere civil*, as you conceine of them.

Your *minor* proposition offendeth in the same capti- on that your *maior* doth. For say that the good civil vse of

Pet. Mart. ep. 4
ad Hoppernos.

Aug. cons. Cres-
con. Gramma.
lib. 1. cap. 1.

the Crosse is abused & worshipped by the Papists, what is that to vs? *Indifferentia non possunt illos, qui pura sincerag, agunt mente, & conscientia, contaminare*, why I pray you may not we vse that well, which they vsed ill? As well as an Orthodox writer may vse the same Logick & Rhetoricke, to proue the truth, which Heretickes doe to op-
pugne the truth? Or an honest Souldier vse those weapons in defence of his coutry, which Rebels and Traytors vse for the destruction and desolation thereof, as was before alleadged out of S^r. *Augustine*. Your proofe holdeth well for the *materiall signe*, and for the *superstitious* conceipt of the Crosse in Baptisme, but that they adored them as an *Idoll*, remaineth yet to be proved.

Cōcerning the *religious* vse of the signe of the *Crosse* in Baptisme, he saith two things.

First that among the Ancients, it was never free frō sin, and superstition: Secondly if it were, yet being a *humane ordinance*, and abused, & made a most abhominable *Idoll*, no water can cleanse it &c.

Hem. in cap. 5.
ep. 1. Joan.

Touching the *first*, which of their religious vses doe you meane? If that which they holde in their actions of common life; we neither commend it, nor condemne it; we condemne it not, because we suppose it may be well vsed, when it is done, only to excite, and put vs in minde of Christ crucified, without any conceite of *vertue* or *meritt*, or *power* therein reposed, as we verily thinke the Auncients vsed it; *Qui mane surgens & vesperti cubitum vadens, signat se cruce, in signum Christiane militiae, contra Satanam, nō est culpandus, modo absit superstitio*. We commend it not, because we knowe how apt the common people are, to be led away with that misconceipt, that so long hath clouen vnto it: And yet we cāno waies
allow

allow of yours, nor of your *Patriarch T. C.* iudgment, Sec. 13.
 wherwith he censureth it. *That the Lord hath left a mark* T. C. lib. 1.
of his curse upon it, wherby it might be perceived to come Pag. 170.
out of the forge of mans braine &c. This censure of his
 is too perēptory, & offendeth not only against the rule
 of *Charity*, that bids vs thinke the best of them, whom we
 knowe not, especially of the *Auntients*; but of *Iustice*
 also: In that he laieth the fault, of superstitious succee-
 ding ages, vppon the religious and godly Fathers, that
 were before them. For why might not that be without
 abuse at the first, which we are certaine, was greatly a-
 buled afterwards, as wel as the *sepulchers* of *Martirs*, &
reliques of *Saints*, and the *Images* of *Christ*, and his *A-*
postles, al which had a good vse at the first, and yet af-
 terwards where occasions of hainous Idolatry and su-
 perstition.

*P. Martyr in
 esp. 7. Judic.
 Beza de moris
 Eccles. Cathol.*

Yf you meane their religious vse of the signe of the
Crosse in the Sacrament of Baptism, we vtterly disclaime
 your sentence, and doubt not but that it was free from
 sinn, and superstition, both in the *Auntients*, and in our
Church. And to this your rash and inconsiderate con-
 demning of the *Auntient Fathers*, and by them vs, we
 oppose the more temperate and indifferent opinions, of
 your owne freinds; who by how much they were more
 learned then your selfe, so much the more modest, and
 respectiue they were of *Antiquity*, then are you. And
 because you shal not thinke, that Jwil peruert or falsifie
 their meanings by my interpretation, Jwill set downe
 their speaches in their owne words, as J find them in
 their writings.

M^r *Beza* doth both grant, by way of Cōcession, that Beza respons ad
 Franc. Baldwin.
 there might be a good vse of it in the Primitiue Church

Fueris

Beza de Eccle.
mibo. neri.

Fuerit sanè tempus, quo fuit aliquis istius signaculi, aduersus Christi crucifixi contemptores usus: sit etiam diu et libenter a Christianis usurpatus, pro externa vera religionis professione, & alio in expresse words affirme, Crucis consignationem, cōstat initio fuisse apertam Christianismi professionem.

Heming. in ep.
2. Joan. cap. 5.

Hemingius deliuering certaine obseruations & conditions, how the signe of the Crosse may in thele daies bewel vsed in the Church, concludeth with this testimony of Antiquity. *His rationibus existimo v̄sos esse signo crucis Augustinum, Epipharium, Athanasium, qui multū signaculo crucis tribuerunt, propter significationē et admonitionem.*

Bucer in ordin.
Eccles. cap. 12.

Bucers testimony to this purpose is most famous, that it was, *usus in Ecclesia antiquissimi, admodum simplex, et presentis admonitionis crucis Christi.*

Pezel. in Refus
catech. Jesuit.

Pezelius speaketh more plainly in their commendation, *Antiqui hoc signo profitebantur, quòd Christiani essent, quòd crucis Christi eos non puderet, quòd in Christo spem, et fiduciam omnem collocatam haberent.*

Daneus respon.
ad Bellar. cont.
7. ad cap. 29.

Daneus yet goeth further, and saith *Finis propter quē Patres laudes istas signo crucis Christi tribuunt, sanctus et pius est: Patres enim illas laudes scribunt de signo crucis quatenus est, et erat confessionis Christianorum inreputanda de Christo testimonium, liberum, apertum, manifestum, licet illis propterea minarentur Ethnici penas grauissimas. Erat igitur huius signi inter Ethnicos usurpatio, confessio de Christo crucifixo, pulcherrima. &c.*

Perkinsus in
Demonst. prob.
cap. de signo
crucis num. 2.

M^r. Perkins not only exculeth it from superstition in the Ancients, but also declareth, as Daneus did, wherein it was iustly commended by the fathers. His wordes are thele. *Crux non fuit à veteribus adorata, multò minus la-*

triâ

ſua adorata: veneratio tantum ei tributa fuit, id eſt uſus cum reuerentia; eamq; uſurparunt in teſtimonium fidei ſue, ſimulq; laudant, quatenus fuit ſignum intrebide fidei in Chriſtum crucifixum ante ethnicoſ, etiam dum illi penas minarentur.

Zanchius ſpeaking of the uſe of this ſigne in Conſtantineſ time, freeth al the former ages from ſuperſtition, *Huc uſq; nihil ſuperſtitionis habebat ſignum illud.*

Zanch. de oper. Redem. l. i. c. 15.

Laſtly Goulartius ſpeaketh more plainly in this point, then any other, *Quamvis veteres Chriſtiani* (ſaith he) *externo ſigno crucis uſi ſunt, id tamen fuit ſine aliqua ſuperſtitione; et doctrina de Chriſti merito, ab errore, qui poſtea irrepiſit, pios ſeruauit immunes.* And in another place. *Tertulliani ſeculo, et aliquot ſequentibus, Chriſtiani cum Ethnicis Chriſtum crucifixum deridentibus permixti, ut doctrina ſalutaris, quæ in Chriſtū nos credere iubet, ſe minime pudere teſtarentur, digitis in ære formabant figuram tranſuerſam quaſi crucis, quæ Cerimonia tunc erat Chriſtianiſmi, non ſuperſtitionis Magica, (ut poſtea accidit,) ſymbolum.*

Goulart. in Cyp. ad Demet. cap. 19.

Idem in Cyri Ep. 56. ad Thibarianoſ, ca. 7.

That it might once haue had good uſe, and was a profeſſion of Chriſtianity, as Mr. Beza ſpeaketh, Or that S^r. Auguſtine, and other Auntients uſed it with ſuch due regard, as therto belonged, as Hemingius thinketh, Or that it was a moſt auntient uſe in the Church, very ſim- ple, and of preſent admonition of the Croſſe of Chriſt, as Bucer teſtifieth: to my vnderſtanding doth plainly deſcribe, a moſt Chriſtian and religious uſe of it, among the Auntients, and vtterly diſcouer your ſlaunderous ac- cuſation.

But thoſe other that tel you particularly, wherein it was wel uſed, as Pezel. M. perk. & by a propoſition moſt ma-

nifestly contradiſtory vnto yours, ſay, it had a moſt *holy* and *godly* end, as *Daneus*, and that it was 'without any ſu-
perſtition in the Auntients, as *Goulartius*, & *Zanchius*
doe, They J ſay plainly free it from ſinn and ſuperſtitiō,
and with a contrary testimony in flat termes, conuince
the inſolency, and audaciouſnes of your ſalle aſſeue-
ration.

Touching the ſecond. *if it were: yet being an humane*
ordinance &c. your two reaſons, *because it is an humane*
ordinance abuſed, and *because it is now alſo become an I-*
doll, are answered before. And it hath oftentimes bin
ſaid, that thoſe pollutions how abhominable ſoeuer, doe
extend them ſelues no farther, then to the *Persons* that
are polluted with them: Indifferent things cannot de-
file them, that vſe them with a ſincere mindē, and pure
conſcience, how ſoeuer they be abuſed by others:

And therfore you might wel haue ſpared your huge
words, *Exetcrable, abhominable Idol, filth, no water cā*
clenſe it, nor any pretext purifie it, &c. except you had
brought other arguments then theſe, the weaknes wher
of doth moſt manifeſtly appeare. Al the bigg words, that
you can bring, wil not make the *uncleannes*, you ſpeake
of, deſile the *Innocent*, nor the pollution, and abhomi-
nation, of *Popiſh* Idolatry, cleaue vnto the true *Proteſtāt*,
that with a good conſcience, vſeth the Ceremony, and
with hart and ſoule, abhorreth the ſuperſtition. And
thus much to the ſecond part of your anſwere. Your
third followeth now to be conſidered.

Treatiſe. 10. Sect.

But in very deed to ſpeake as the truth is, the Croſſe is re-
tained among vs, with opinion very ſuperſtitious, & erro-
neous: For in the late Canons it is ſaide, that the Childe is
there-

thereby dedicated unto the service of him that died on the Crosse: what is this but to equal mans ordinance with Gods? And to ascribe that unto the Crosse, which is due unto Baptisme? A conceipt fitter for ignorant Papists, then learned Christians to assent unto. Neither do we use it as the Ancients did, for Cyprian, Augustine, Chrysostome and others, as is apparant at those times did consecrate the elements therewith, and did not crosse the childes forehead at all, but referred that unto the Bishops confirmation; So that our crossing the Infants forehead, & not the element of Baptisme, is a meere novelty, without any warrant of that antiquitie. Neither will that place of Tertullian de resurrectione carnis. proue the contrary. The flesh is washed, that the soule may bee purged, the flesh is annointed, that the soule may be consecrated, the flesh is signed that the soule may be garded, the flesh is shadowed by the imposition of hands, that the soule may be by the spirit enlightened, the flesh doth feede on the body & bloud of Christ, that the soule may be filled and fattened of God. In which words, he joining together divers Ceremonies of the Christians, doth indeed mention the signing of the faithful, but it may as well be referred to confirmatio, expressed by imposition of hands, as to Baptisme, understood by the washing of the body; & that on better reason, for it is more then probable, that the signe of the Crosse was not yet used in Baptisme, seeing, Just. Martyr in defens. ad Antoninum. & Tertull. de Baptisme, & de corona militis, doe describe the forme of Baptisme, used in those times, and yet make no mention of the Crosse therein: which in all likelihood they would not have omitted, if it had bin used therein; Especially Tertullian, who in that very place speaketh of the Crosse, as used out of Baptisme in the ordinary blessing of themselves.

*Replie to the third part of the Treatisers.
answere to the first obiection.*

This tenth Section containeth two grievous accusations, wherewith the Treatiser doth charge our Church, and the governors thereof.

The first, That the signe of the Crosse is retained among vs, with opinion very superstitious and erroneous.

The second, That we doe not vse it as the Ancients did: Grievous crimes no doubt, if they be iustly laid vpon vs; But if vniustly, then meere reproaches, and slanders of the Treatiser.

Touching the first. *S. Hierome* saith, *In causa hereseos, neminem decet esse patientem.* It becommeth no mā to hold patience, when he is accused of heresie. The Treatiser be like, meant to trie our patience, when he burdened vs with *opinion of the Crosse both erroneous and superstitious.* If he had accused vs of error only, the matter had not bin so very great. For, *homines sumus, errare possumus:* we are men, and therefore subiect vnto errour. And yet here also he might haue remembred, that the companie of those learned men that made the Canon, was as vni-likely to erre, as either the Treatiser or his adherents. But whē vnto his accusation of error, he addeth the most heinous crime of *superstition*, this is such an imputation, as whereof by all good meanes we are bound to cleare our selues.

But he proveth it: for in the late Canons, it is said, that the child is thereby dedicated vnto the service of him, that died on the Crosse, what is this but to equall mans ordināce with Gods? And to ascribe that vnto the Crosse, which is due vnto Baptisme? A conceipt fitter for ignorant Papists then learned Christians to assent vnto. If wee assented ei-ther

ther to the one or to the other, it were indeede not onlie a concept fitter for ignorant Papifts, then learned Chriſtians, but alſo an opinion erroneus and ſuperſtitious, and which is more, proud, inſolent, and preſumptuous too.

But how doth the word *dedicated*, inſoſce thus much: namely, *becauſe the Sacrament, which is Gods ordinance, can doe no more but Dedicate the Infant, to the ſervice of him that died on the Croſſe. And therefore when wee ſaie, the ſigne of the Croſſe, which is but mans invention, doeth Dedicate, doe we not equall mans ordinance with Gods? & aſcribe that vnto the Croſſe which is due vnto the Sacrament?* Janſwere, no: For *fiſt* the Sacrament doth more then *dedicate* only, for it really giueth that which it promiſeth, & is to the child that, which it doth ſignifie. Contrariwiſe, the *Croſſe*, neither giueth any thing to the child, nor promiſeth, nor is any other thing, then an outward Ceremony only, ſignifying that the child hereafter ſhould not be aſhamed to confeſſe the faith of Chriſt crucified, &c.

Secondly, the word *Dedicate* doth not alwaies ſignifie, to ſanctiſie or to Conſecrate, but ſometimes to appropriate, to appoint to ſome ſpeciall uſe, to declare and teſtifie, that the thing is aſſigned, addicted, and culled out to ſuch, or ſuch a ſeuerall *purpose, office perſon, or ſervice*. And this is moſt manifeſt, by that uſe of this word, which is moſt ordinary and common in our ſpeech: As namely, to *dedicate* a book to a great perſonage, is not in in our language to conſecrate, & ſanctiſie it vnto him, but by that word of *Dedication*, we teſtifie and declare our loue, duty, & affection towards him, & appoint the book ſo dedicated, to be a manifeſt ſigne, token, prooſe, argument, and declaration of our loue. The word *Dedicated* therefore being Eccleſiaſticall, and very frequent in

this signification, it was thought fitt to be retained in this matter, rather then to take, in a word more strang. & nothing so significant: Especially considering, that there are many words, and sentences in that Canon, both affirmatiue and negatiue, very sufficient to declare, and make manifest vnto al reasonable men, that the Church of England doeth not attribute any sanctifying, or consecrating of the child to the seruice of Christ, vnto any *vertue, grace, or power, of, or in the signe of the Crosse.*

Thirdly though both the *Sacrament*, and the *signe* of the *Crosse* may be said to *dedicate*, yet they doe not both dedicate *after the same sort*, for the *Sacrament* doth dedicate *as a signe*, and *as a Sacrament too*, the *Crosse* as a *signe* or *ceremony only*, the *Sacrament* doth dedicate as a *cause efficient instrumentall, working inwardly*, by the operation of Gods spirite, the *Crosse* doth dedicate as a *cause declaratory, testimonial, witnessing outwardly* to the Church, and to the partie that is baptized. And so much the very wordes of the Canon woulde haue taught you, but that you would not learne, when it saith, *Accounting it a lawfull outward Ceremony, and honorable badge, whereby the Infant is dedicated, &c.*

The wearing of a badge, or cognizance of some noble man, or the colours of some Captaine, doth not, I hope, in your apprehension, make the seruant or souldior that weareth it, to be of such a noble mans retinew, or such a captaines regiment. But because he is of that retinewe, he weareth that badge or cognizance, and because hee is of that regimēt, he weareth those colours. And yet both the one and the other, doth make other men to know, & withall doth put himselfe in remembrance, that such a noble mans man, or such a captaines souldior hee is, and
such

such he ought to shew himselfe to be. Even so it is in the matter of the Crosse. The signe of the Crosse maketh not the childe to be the servant, or souldior of Christ, but because by Baptisme he is so made, therefore he is signed with that honorable badge, that thereby, both other mē may know that he is the servant, and souldior of Christ, and himselfe may be remembred, and admonished, that he is in al his life to shew himselfe as the faithfull servant of such a master, and the couragious souldior of such a captaine: Which our Communion book most wisely, & beyond all exception of malice, letteth downe in these religious tearmes. *In token, that he shall not be ashamed to confesse the faith of Christ crucified, and manfully to fight vnder his banner, against sin, the world, and the Diuel, and to continue his faithfull souldiour and servant vnto his liues end.*

*Declaratorie
quoad alios,
memoratiue, et
monitorie quo-
ad seipsum.*

Lastly, if the Canon should haue said, *sanctified*, or *consecrated*, I perceiue, we should haue had much a do with the Treatiser: And yet al Antiquity, as afterwards I shal haue better occasion to declare, and specially S^r. *Augustine* teacheth vs so to say. *Catechumenos*, saith he, *secundum quendam modum suum, per signum Christi, & orationē manus impositionis, puto sanctificari.* I thinke the Catechumeni are sanctified, after a certaine manner of theirs, by the signe of Christ, and praier of laying on of handes. But what neede I alludge S^r. *Augustine*, our owne men vse the word *consecrare* to signifie, to allot, or appoint for some vse, as I told you before the word *dedicare* did signifie: As may appeare at large by the testimony of *Gou-*
lartius, *Consecrare panem & vinum, est ea diuinis ac sa-*
cris vñibus destinare, &c. But our Canon of purpose de-
clined those words, which might any waies breed offēce

*Aug. de peccat.
meritis & re-
missione, lib. 2.
cap. 26.*

*Goulars. Cyp.
ep. 63. num. 39.*

vnto the weake brethren, and made choice of this harmlesse and innocent word, *Dedicated*, which favorably vnderstood, giueth no offence, and is farr from al such danger of *error & superstition*, as the Treatiser would make the ignorant reader to beleene.

Your second accusation laieth two greiuous Corruptions to our charge, as namely.

1 *That in the sign of the Crosse we doe not that which the Auntients did. For Cyprian Augustine, Chrysostome, and others, as is apparant, at those times did consecrate the elements therewith, which wee doe not.*

2 *That we doe that which the Auntients did not: For they did not crosse the childs forehead at all, but referred that vnto the Bishopps confirmation: So that our crossing the Infants forehead, & not the element of Baptisme, is a mere nouelty, (of some 600. yeares standing as you say in the Margent) without any warrant of that antiquity.*

For answer to the first. *That we do not al that the Auntients did*, that is, not vse the signe of the Crosse to so many purposes, as they did, we do easily acknowledge: But this is nothing to the point in question. For what if this particular you alleadge, of *consecrating the Element with the sign of the Crosse*, were one of those *New* of the Ancients? What if they, haply, did amisse in so doing, as you say afterwards they did? Or what if they did well in so doing, & the superstition was brought in afterwards? Will you haue vs to imbrace their vices as well as their vertues? Or wil you take away the liberty of our Church in making choice of her Ceremonies? Or will you hence conclude, that we may not retaine their good things, for the which they are worthely commended, except we also receiue those defectes and imperfections, which suc-

ceeding ages brought in afterwardeſe? But this is no way agreeable to reaſon: I rather think it better to follow that counſel that S^r. Hieron giueth, of reading *Origens* works, *Hieron. ad Trāquil l. 1. ep. 54.* and to apply it to this matter of the Ceremonies of the Auntients, *Vt bona eorum eligamus, vitemusq; cōtraria, iuxta Apōſtolum dicentem, omnia probate, quod bonum eſt tenete &c.* That we chooſe their good things, and avoid the cōtrary, according to the Apoſtles ſaying, Try al things, keepe that which is good. For they which are carried away, either with too much loue, or with too much hatred of him, by the diſtemper of their ſtomacke, ſeeme vnto me to be vnder that curſe of the Prophet, *woe be vnto them, that call good euill, and euil good, that make ſower ſweete, and ſweete ſower.* *1. Theſſ. 1. 21. Iſai. 5. 20.*

But *Cyprian, Auguſtine, Chryſoſtome, and others* did conſecrate the Elements, you ſay, with the ſigne of the Croſſe, which we doe not. They did indeed, and in thoſe times they did it wel: Jf we ſhould now doe the like, we could not chooſe, but doe very ill.

That they did wel in ſo doing, J am the rather perſwaded for my part, (For J am not willing to conceiue any thing amiſſe of thoſe bleſſed, and excellent inſtruments of Gods glory, that by any reaſonable conſtruction of their words may be ſalued) becauſe they did it *without offence*, in reſpect of others, and *without opinion of vertue* alcribed to the ſigne of the Croſſe, if you reſpect their owne iudgments. *without offence to others*, for at that time the Inſtitutiō of that Ceremony, & the reaſons of the Inſtitution, were ſo wel knowne vnto al men, that no man could be ignorant of them, nor take offence at them: *without opinion of vertue* in the ſigne, in their owne iudgments, *Becauſe that conſecration or*

Ang. de peccat.
meritis & re-
miss. lib. 2. c. 26.

sanctification which they attributed to the signe of the Croffe, was rather *in name* so called, then any *hallowing*. indeed, and rather an *outward declaration*, that the elements were consecrated, then any *cause* of their *consecration*. And that this was their conceit of the signe of the Croffe, is most manifestly apparant by those words of S^r. *Augustine*. *Sanctificatio Cathemeni; si non fuerit baptizatus, non sibi valet ad intrandū regnum cœlorū, aut ad remissionē peccatorū*. Again, they did not ascribe that consecratiō of the elements, how little soever they thought it to be, vnto the sign of the Croffe, which they made vppon it, but alwaies with the signe ioined something els. So the same S^r. *Augustine* in that place whē he saith, *Cathemenos secundum quendam modum suū puto consecrari per signum Christi*, doth not rest there, & say only, *Signū Christi*, but ioineth thereunto, *et orationem manus impositionis*. and so S^r. *Cyprian*, whose testimony you cite afterwards, saith indeed, *Operationis auctoritas in figura crucis, omnibus sacramentis largitur effectum*, but withal he addeth. (which you thought wīdome to suppress, as not making for your purpose) & *cuncta peragit Nomen, quod omnibus nominibus eminet, a sacramentorum vicarijs invocatum*. But of this we shal say more in the 12. section.

Cyp. de passion.
dom. cap. 11.
Sect. 12.

That we should doe very ill, if we should vſe this Ceremony now, these reasons induce me to cōceiue. *First*, The people are now more prone to error, and misconceit, then they were in those times. *Secōdly*, some things, and among others this, were more fit for those times, then for these. *Distinguenda sunt tempora*, saith *Goulartius*. and before him S^r. *Augustine*, and then it wil easily appear, that that may be done wel at one time, which can-

Goulart. in Cy-
prian Epist. 56.
ad Thibartian.

cannot be done wel at another. *Mutai à quippe temporis causa, quod rectè ante factum fuerit, ita mutari vera ratio plerumq; flagitat, ut cum aliqui dicant, non rectè fieri, si mutetur, contra veritas clamet, rectè non fieri nisi mutetur: quia utrumq; tunc erit rectum, si erit pro temporū varietate diuersum.* As in a child many things are permitted by the Parents, which wil not be, when he is come to riper yeares: So in that *infancy* and *innocency* of the Church, many things might wel be done, by the Aun-
tients, which cannot be wel done by vs, now in the mā-
hood, or rather *old age* of the Church: And lawful it was
for them, while Christianity was yet but *greene*, to be
led and brought on by those outward rudiments, which
we haue no neede of now.

If you aske, why these reasons, should not aswel make
against the signing of the Childe in the forehead, as a-
gainst the signing of the Elements, The answer is easie:
first, the danger is not so great, nor so remediable in the
one, as in the other, *Secondly*, the ends are different: The
signing of the Childs forehead was then, and is now, for
admonition; The signing of the Elements, was the *dange-*
rous, and would now be desperat for *consecration*, if we
should imbrace it: And therefore me thinks, you should
rather commend the wisdom of our Church, which out
of the nūber of those Ceremonies, which were trouble-
some to good consciences, and burdensome to the
Church, as that learned Bishop speaketh; hath culled
those which were *harmeleffe*, then any way dislike vs, for
not retaining all those ceremonies of this signe, which
though vsed by the Ancients, might proue scandalous
to the weaker sort.

Iuell. in Apolog.

For answer to the *Second*, That we doe that which the

Ancients did not, for they did not crosse the childes forehead at all, but referred that vnto the Bishops confirmation. I make no doubt, but the Treatiser by the *Ancients*, that he speaketh of, entēdeth those especially, that were nearest vnto the *Apostles* times, & that flourished within the compasse of the *first three hundred yeares*: which by al men is reputed the *purest age*, & as it were, the maidenhead, and virginity of the Church. For he cannot be ignorant, that in the ages that succeeded after them, this custome was most ordinary & frequent in all Churches. This supposed I answer:

First, That either the Treatiser is deceived, or the whole Christiā world for so many ages together, hath bin very greatly overseene, that, ever since the first times, even from such as lived with the Apostles theselues, haue receaved this consignatiō of the childes forehead in Baptisme, as one of the most ancient Ceremonies of christianity. This is acknowledged, not only by our best *late writers*, whose speeches to that purpose I haue reported before, in the 88. and 89. pages, but also by the *Ancients*, out of whō they learned it, whose authorities come now to be considered. So that if the Treatiser can reforme this common errour, of so many learned men, and of so long continuance, he shal do (no doubt,) a good work, & a great service to the Church of Christ; This hee cannot bring about, except hee either deny the authorities of the *Ancients*, or giue their words some other interpretation, then they doe apparantly signifie, & al men hitherto haue made of them.

*Dionysius lib.
Eccles. Hierar.
cap. 4. & 5.*

Dionysius commonly called *Areopagite* (whether truly or falsly I wil not discusse, but certainly a *very ancient writer*), maketh often mention, of signing the party that

is

is baptised, with the sign of the Crosse, And to expresse that he meaneth the Crosse in Baptisme, he calleth the Sacrament of Baptisme *συμβολὴν ὁμοπαιδεία*, the Sacramēt or scale hauing the forme of a Crosse; And describing the māner how it was done, he saith, *Imponit (minister) eius capiti manum, cōsignansq; illum. sacerdotibus mādāt, virum susceptoremq; describant.* This authority must needs be vnderstood of Baptisme, which he there describeth, calling it *Sacramentum illuminationis*, and can by no interpretation be referred either to the Element, as is manifest by the words, *Imponit eius capiti manum, cōsignansq; illum*, nor to the Bishoppes confirmation.

The like is to be thought of that place of *Iustin Martyr*, who florished about the yeare of Christ 140. *Dextra manu in nomine Christi consignamus eos, qui hoc signo egent*: where, first al men vnderstand him, to meane the consignation of the Crosse. Secondly, that he cannot meane it of confirmation, it is more then probable, because hee mentioneth only *dexteram manum*, whereas confirmation requireth imposition of both; *ut adumbratio septiformis gratie melius significaretur*, that the adumbration of the leauen-fold grace, might thereby be the better signified. Thirdly, it cannot be vnderstoode of the Element of Baptisme, for his wordes are *consignamus, &c. qui hoc signo egent*, importing the persons, and not the Element. Neither lastly can it be referred to that use of the Crosse, which they obserue in actions of common life, because in that, euery man did signe him selfe, but in this he speaketh of such as were signed by other men.

The next that I will remember after him, is *Origen* (for *Tertullians* testimony, because the Treatiser alleadgeth it against vs, shalbe cōsidered afterwards) who

Origen. Homil.
2. in Psal. 38.
Tem. I.

liued in the same age with *Tertullian*, though somewhat after him, about the yeare of our Lord 220. his words are these. *Vt non exprobrecur ab insipiente, cōvertamus nos ab omnibus iniquitatibus nostris, ne deprehendens in nobis maculas peccatorum, id est, suae voluntatis insignia, exprobet, et dicat, ecce hic Christianus dicebatur, et signo Christi signabatur in fronte, meas autem voluntates, et mea chirographa gerebat in corde. Ecce iste, qui mihi et operibus meis renunciavit in Baptismo, meus rursum operibus se inseruit meisque legibus paruit.* This is an evident testimony against the Treatiser, mentioning both *Baptisme*, and the *signe* of the *Crosse*, and the *forehead* where on it was signed.

Seft. 12.
Cyprian de v-
nit. Eccl. ca. 16.

From *Origen* I come to *S^c. Cyprian*, who was famous in the Church about the yeare 250. whose testimonies against the Treatisers assertion, as I wil not take vpō me to repeate theā, (for they are very many,) so it cānot be either misliked or suspected, if I acquaint the reader with some few: especially seeing the Treatiser himselte doeth acknowledge *Cyprian* to be the first, that maketh mention of the *Crosse* in Baptism. In his treatise *de unitate Ecclesiae*, he hath these words. *Ozias Rex lepra varietate in fronte maculatus est, ea parte corporis notatus offenso Domino, ubi signantur, qui dominum promerentur.* Againc,

Ad Demet. ca.
19.

to *Demetrian* Proconsull of *Africke*, he speaketh thus. *Evadere eos solos posse, qui renati & signo Christi signati fuerint*, and a little after, *Hunc (Christum) si fieri potest, sequamur omnes, huius sacramento & signo consecremur.* In

Cap. 22.

Cap. 7.

Cap. 22.

all which places, as also in his fifty sixth Epistle *ad Thibartianos*, and his third booke *Testimon. ad Quirinum*, not only *Pamelius* who may seeme somewhat partial for the *Crosse*, but *Goulartius* also, whom the Treatiser cannot
sus

suspect, doe acknowledge that he speaketh of the Crosse in Baptisme.

Lactantius that lived after *Cyprian* about some 50. yeares, and flourished in the beginning of the yeare 300 speaketh much to the same purpose. *Extendit Christus in passione manus suas, orbemq; dimensus est, ut iam tum ostenderet, ab ortu solis vsq; ad occasum, magnum populum ex omnibus linguis, & tribubus congregatū, sub alas suas esse venturum, signumq; illud maximum atq; sublime, in frontibus suis suscepturum.* *De vera sapient. lib. 4. cap. 26.*

After *Lactantius* lived *S^t. Basil the great* in the Church of *Cæsarea Cappadocia*, in the yeare 370. or thereabouts, who rehearsing the traditiōs vsed in his time, reckoneth this in the first place. *Vt signo crucis eos signemus, qui in Christo spem suam posuerunt.* *Basil de spiritus sancto. cap. 27.*

The last of this age, is *S^t. Augustine*, whose glorious labours lightened the Christian world, about the end of the yeare 300. To rehearse his many testimonies were an endlesse worke; and therefore I will content my selfe with two only, the former in his fourth booke *de fide & Symbolo ad Catechumenos*, which he beginneth with these words, *Per sacratissimum crucis signum, vos suscepit in utero, sancta mater Ecclesia:* and the latter in his exposition of the 30. *Psalme. Non sine causa signum suū Christus in fronte nobis figi voluit, tanquam in sede pudoris, ne Christi opprobrio Christianus erubescat.* *Aug. de fide & symb. ad Catech. lib. 4. cap. 1.* To the which purpose he speaketh in *Psalm. 141. vsq; adeo de cruce non erubesco, ut non in occulto loco habeam crucē Christi, sed in fronte portem, &c.* *In Psalm 30.* To which place I refer the reader as also to his 53. and 118. Treatise, vpon *S^t. Iohn*: & his 181. sermon *de tempore*, and diuers other places. So that these proofs of the *Auntients* duly considered, we may

Demonst. prob.
ca. de signo cru-
cis.
Refut. Catech.
Iesuitic.

may be bould to pronounce against the Treatiser, that the Auntients did vse to signe the Childs forehead in Baptisme, and to affirme with M^r. Perkins, *Signum crucis per multa secula fuit in sacramēt administratione, simplex ritus*; and with Pezelius. *vetus est hac Ceremonia ab ipsis incunabilis Ecclesie Christiane usurpata.*

The collection therfore of the Treatiser is vaine, whē he concludeth after this sort.

They that in the vse of the signe of the Crosse in Baptisme, doe not consecrate the Element, which the Auntients did, & doe crosse the Childs forehead, which the Auntients did not, doe not vse the signe of the Crosse, in Baptisme as the Auntients did.

But the Church of England in the vse of the signe of the Crosse in Baptisme, doth not consecrate the Element, which the Auntients did, and doth crosse the Childs forehead which the Auntients did not. Ergo.

The Church of England doth not vse the signe of the Crosse in Baptisme as the Auntients did.

For first, touching the forme, it is a Sophisme compounded of all manner of Fallacies. that which is most apparant is, *Fallacia compositionis*: for *ex propositione verā in sensu composito, infer conclusionem falsam in sensu diuiso*. Touching the matter, it is meerly false. For in the Major it doth assume, that the Auntients did not vse to signe the Childs forehead, which is refuted by their alleadged authorities.

Secondly he doth conclude the abuse of one Ceremony, by the Non vse of another, which hath neither relation vnto it, nor dependency on it, nor both are ordained to the same end: & therfore the one cannot necessarily inferre the negation or affirmation of the other: as if with

with leſſe adoe. and in fewer circumſtances, he ſhould have concluded thus.

They that in the uſe of the ſigne of the Croſſe in Baptiſme, doe not uſe conſecration of the Element at all: doe not uſe the conſignation of the forehead well, and as the Aunſients did.

But the Church of England in the uſe of the ſigne of the Croſſe in Baptiſme, doth not uſe conſecratio of the Element at all. Ergo.

The Church of England doth not uſe the conſignation of the forehead rightly, and as the Aunſients did.

The not uſing of conſecration at all, is no reaſon why the conſignation of the forehead may not be uſed rightly. For though both agree in this, that they both be conſignations, and are both uſed in the Sacrament of Baptiſme, yet they differ in this, that they are diſtinct Ceremonies, differing one from another in nature, for they are meerly diſtinct, and have no dependency, the one of the other: & in uſe, For they are not *ad Idem*, they have not both reference to the ſame end and action. the one preſumptuouſly going before the Sacrament, and arrogating to it ſelfe ſome kind of preparing of the Action, the other modeſtly coming after, and admoniſhing vs only, what we promiſed in the Action.

I might better conclude thus againſt their nouelties in the Lords ſupper.

They which doe not receiue the Communion kneeling, which the Aunſients did, and doe receiue it ſtanding or ſitting, which the Aunſients did not, doe not receiue the communion as the Aunſients did.

But the Treatiſer and his adherents doe not receiue the communion kneeling, which the^a Aunſients did, and doe^a receiue

^a Geniculatio
ſpecie habet pie
& Chriſtiane
venerationis, ac
proinde potuit
olim cum fructu
uſui pari. Bez.
Epiſt. 12.

receiue it standing or sitting, which the *Auntients* did not.
Ergo:

The Treatiser and his adherents doe not receiue the communion as the Auntients did.

For here, though the Ceremonies of kneeling which the *Auntients* vsed, and of sitting or standing, which the Treatisers friends vse, be *different*, the one frō the other: yet both the affirmatiō of the one, doth necessarily inter the *negation* of the other, and also both of them are ordained to the same end and Action, namely the receiving of the communion.

Perkins demon-
strat cap. de sig-
no crucis.

Thirdly the Treatiser assuming it, as a thing granted, that the Ceremony of *consecrating* the Element, is auncienter then the Ceremony of *signing the forehead*, doth thereupon conclude, that the most auncient of the Fathers vsed the *consecration* of the Element, long before the *consignatiō* of the forehead was heard of. Wherin he is exceedingly deceiued: For though the Ceremony of *consecration* be of great antiquity, yet he may learne of M^r. Perkins, that it is not to compare with *consignation*. For he saith. *Annus a Christo 300 crux transiens*, (which is the consignation of the Crosse) *fuit signum externae professionis fidei*. not only *adhibitum in vitā communi*, as he saith, but in *Baptisme* also, as before is proued out of the Auntients: But M^r. Perkins staieeth not there, he saith further: *vix unquam adhibita fuit ad signandum sacramēta, nisi circa annum 400*. Neither then was it straight-way vsed in cōsecrating of the Elemēts, but by degrees: *primò ut signaret nobis Christi bona*, Aug: tract: 118. in Ioannem: *tum postea ut per eam benedictio sacramenti & consecratio fieret*.

Why the Treatiser should deliuer vs this strange doctrine,

rine, That the *Auntients* did not use to signe the Childs forehead at all in Baptisme, I cannot conceiue: only I suppose his error might come thus: The *Auntients* speaking of two uses of the cōsignatiō, the one in commō life, the other in the Sacrament, as is said before, doe make farre more often mention of the vse in common life, then of the other, and sometimes ioine them both together in one periode: So that except the iudgment of the reader, can direct him to descerne, which clause belongeth to the one vse, & which to the other, the error in this point is very ealy: And so it seemeth the Treatiser was deceiued, applying al their speaches wherfoeuer, to the vse in common actions, and referring none to that in the Sacrament of Baptisme. But now let vs see how he prooueth his assertion.

First the *Auntients* referred that, (saith he,) to the Bishoppes confirmation, so that our crossing the infants forehead, & not the Element of Baptisme, is a meere noueltie &c: True it is, that in confirmation, the Childs forehead was signed by the Bishopp, but how doth this cōvince, that in Baptisme it was not signed by the Minister? That in confirmation, the Childs forehead was signed, we easily beleeeue, for so *Tertullian* telleth vs in many places, and *Cyprian* in his Epistle ad Iubaianum, *Nunc quoq; apud nos geritur, ut qui in Ecclesia baptizantur, pr.e. positus Ecclesie offerantur. per nostram orationem, ac manus impositionem spiritum sanctum consequantur, et signaculo Dominico consumentur.* But the affirmation of this doth not inferre a negation of the other. Yes, say you, they referred that vnto the Bishops confirmatiō: They referred indeed confirmation, and al the rites, and Ceremonies therof, vnto the Bishop, as was meete: But did

Tertull. de Bapt. cap. 8.

Cypr. ep. 73. de Heret. baptiz. Cap. 8.

not they, thinke you, performe al the rites of Baptisme themselves; your speech doth import as if you fauored confirmation, and allowed of the consignation there. If you fauor it *truly*, I am glad: for the Ceremony of confirmation is auntient, and hath a good vse (& yet I know not that our Bishoppes vse the consignation of the Crosse in that action) If you mention it only for your purpose, without any allowance of the confirmation, it seemeth you care not what you say, so you may giue the least blowe to our settled orders of the Church. It seemeth likewise, that you ascribe greater antiquity to the signing in confirmatiō, then to that in Baptisme: For you inferre immediatly here vpon, that our crossing the Infants forehead is a meere nouelty. I cannot yeeld, that the signing in confirmation should be auntienter then the signing in Baptisme, no more then I can yeeld, that confirmation is auntienter then Baptisme: And yet for al that, I acknowledge the signing in confirmation to be very auntient, & am glad to heare you argue for the antiquity of that, which your admonitiō to the Parliament so much extenuateth, calling it *superstitious, not agreeing to the word of God, Popish, and peeuish, full of toies, & degenerating frō the first institution*: (I am glad I say, to hear you plead the antiquity of that Ceremony, though it be with opposition to an auntienter) but yet I nether acknowledge *confirmation* so auntient as *Baptisme*: Nor the *signing* of confirmation, so auntient, as the *signing* of Baptisme.

Because you thought, wee woulde not belecue this strange speech of yours vpon your bare word, without prooffe, you note vnto vs in your margent: *Tertull. de Baptismo cap. 7. et 8. Euseb. l. 6. c. 42. Innocent. 1. ep. ad Decen-*

tiū num. 3. *Rabanus Maurus de institutione Clericorū, ca. 30. Durand. Rational divin. li. 1. cap. de consecrat.* You might haue done wel to haue reported their words too, and no doubt, you would haue done it, had they been so pregnant for your purpose, as you make shew. *Tertullian* in that place confesseth indeede, that the signe was vsed in confirmatiō, but neither there, nor in any other place doth he deny it of Baptism. Your second authority sheweth that *Novatus* the Hereticke after his Baptisme, *religqua consecutus non est post morbum, quæ iuxta Ecclesiæ canonem consequi debebat, ob signationem videlicet ab Episcopo.* But how doth this proue that the sign was not vsed in his Baptisme? The like may be said to your testimony out of *Innocentius*, his words indeede are. *De consignandis Infantibus manifestū est, nō ab alio quā Episcopo fieri licere.* But he speaketh this of confirmatiō, only which he there prooveth must be ministred by the Bishop alone, he maketh no mention of Baptism at al. Your other two authorities out of *Rabanus* and *Durandus* speake somewhat more plainly & directly to your purpose: for the first saith *signatur baptizatus cum Chrismate per Sacerdotem in capitis summitate, per pontificem vero in fronte, &c.* The second saith: *Christiani bis ante Baptismū inunguntur oleo benedicto, primo in pectore, deinde inter scapulas, & bis post Baptismum, primò in vertice, deinde per Episcopum in fronte,* making a distinction of the places: To these I answer.

Tertull. de baptis. cap. 9.

Euseb. li. 6. c. 42

Innocent. ad Decent. ep. 1. 30m. 1. coacti.

Raban. Maurus de Instit. clerico. lib. 1. c. 30. Durand. ration. divin. lib. 1. cap. de consecrat. lib. 6. cap. 83.

First, That they make a distinction of the place where this signe was made: in Baptisme on the *crowne*, in cōfirmation on the *forehead*: But they make no distinction of the *signe*, for they say, that the childe in both was signed, whereas your proove should be, that the childe was not

signed in Baptisme.

Secondly, I say that this difference, of the vpper parte of the head, and the forehead, is a nice difference, and might well haue bin the deuile of latter times: Especiallie seeing *Durandus* saith: *Præter unctiões introductæ sunt potius vsu, quam per aliquā scripturā.* *Thirdly*, I answer that in *Durands* time, the childe in Baptisme was not signed in the crown only, but in the forehead too: For so saith *Durandus* your owne author: *Sextum donum Baptismæ est in vertice, id est in summitate capitis, super cerebrū cū chrismate facta per unctio: septimū est in fronte chrismatio:* and that you may be sure, that this, *in fronte chrismatio*, was with the signe of the Crosse, he tels you, that *omnia chrismata cum crucis figurā perficiuntur.* Lastly, I oppole to those late writers, the authorities of the Ancients before rehearsed, and withall the iudgement and liberty of our Church, which rather chose to follow the vniforme simplicity of the Ancients, then the diuers multiplicitie of these latter writers, whom I suppose you doe not quote, (especially *Durandus*) for any liking you haue of them, or credit you yeeld to their authorities.

*Durand. lib 6.
vacion. cap. 83.*

Ibid. cap. 24.

But our crossing of the Infants forehead, and not the Element of Baptisme, is a meere novelty of some 600. yeares standing, &c.

Our crossing of the Infants forehead, & not the Element is no novelty, as hath bin already shewed. Your speech doth sound as if, if we did crosse both the forehead, & the element: then it were no novelty. And this is true too: For crossing of the element also is ancient, though not so ancient as the crossing of the forehead alone. As for your marginal note, of some 600. yeares standing, it is so manifest an vntruth, as I marvaile, you could be per

lwa.

swaded to set it downe.

Secondly, your second prooffe is out of *Tertullian*. Neither wil that place of *Tertullian*, *de resurre& carnis*, proue cap. 3. the contrary: *Caro abluitur, ut & anima emaculetur, caro virgatur ut anima consecretur, caro signatur, ut & anima muniatur, caro manus impositione adumbratur, ut & anima spiritu illuminetur, caro corpore & sanguine Christi vescitur, ut & anima de Deo saginetur*. Hēce you gather that though indeed he mention the signing of the faithfull, yet it may bee as well referred to confirmation as to Baptisme: True; And yet more properly to Baptism, thē to confirmatiō. For in these words, alluding as you say, to diverse Ceremonies of the Christians, it is far more likely (as any man that is acquainted with his articulate manner of writing wil thinke) that he endeavoured rather, equally to fit each severall clause to his severall Ceremonie, then to apply any one to two: which must needs follow vpon your interpretation.

Thirdly. your third prooffe is a *probabili*. It is more then probable, say you, that the signe of the Crosse was not yet used &c. The probability you speake of, is none at al. Concerning *Iustine Martyr* in his second *Apologie to Antoninus*, it was not necessary that he should there mention any thing more, then those things, which did belōg to the substance of Baptisme: For his purpose was to be breife, and not to propose every Ceremonie of Christianity, but to mention only their praiers, and the things essentiall in the Sacrament. And therefore no marvaile, if he did omit this Ceremonie here, especially seeing he doth remember it else where, as hath bin shewed, & euen in this *Apologie* he saith before, that nothing was done, without this figure of the Crosse. Concerning *Tertullian*

tullian, not remembring it in the places, you cite, who, you say, would not haue omitted it, if it had bin then vsed: especially in that very place, where he speaketh of the Crosse, as vsed out of Baptisme: I answer that euen that might be sufficient reason, why he omitted it, when he spake of Baptisme: Because he that saith, *omnem progressum, omnem promotum, and quacunq; nos conuersatio exercet &c.* doth except none, and therefore not Baptisme. Again he that saith it was vsed, in *Actions of ciuil conuersation*, doth leaue no place of doubt, but that it was much rather vsed in their *holy actions of Religion*. Lastly there are some learned mē, that vnderstand those words in the seuenth chapter: *Exinde egressi de lauacro perungimur benedicta vñctione*, of the sign of the Crosse, which was vsed in all annoyntings, as you heard, before out of *Durandus*.

Tert. de Bap.
cap. 7.

Treatise. II. Sect.

2. Obiection.

But the signe of the Crosse is not vsed in Baptisme, but when Baptisme is ended.

Treatisers answer to our 2. Obiection.

If you take Baptisme, only for that dipping and sprinkling of the party, it is true, and so none of the Popish additions, wwhereby they defile the holy Sacrament, are in Baptisme, for those, which apud Bellar. Baptism. comitantur are not impious; But if you take Baptisme, as indeede we doe, for the administration of that Sacrament, then both the prayers before, and the prayers after the Actions, after the dipping, doe all indifferently belong to one and the selfe same thing: yet it is all, vna & continua actio administrationis sacramenti: Sure it is, that it must be said to be, either in Baptismo, extra Baptismum, aut nullibi, if it bee

out

out of Baptisme, how is it by common consent of all said to be, *signum crucis in Baptismo.*

Replie to the Treatisers answere
to our second obiection.

This whole answere to our second obiection is nothing else but a meere cauil of the Treatisers: For though the whole action, being *vna et continua actio administrationis sacramenti*, as you name it, be called Baptisme: Yet it is so called, *a digniori parte*, and therefore we may very wel, & ought alwaies to distinguish, between those things, which are *essentiall* in this action, and those things, which are *accidentall*, betwene those things which are the *substance* of Baptisme, and those things which are for *decency*, & *ornament*: For *ne ij quidem, qui ista excogitarunt, vel ab alijs introducta defenderunt, alius esse censuerunt, quam Baptismi ornamenta.*

Beza resp. ad
Franc. Baldwin.

No, say you, you must not so distinguish, but you must take Baptisme as we doe: for otherwise *None of the Popish additions, whereby they defile that holy Sacrament, are in Baptisme, for those which apud Bellarminum Baptismum comitantur, are not impious*: Al this notwithstanding, you must giue vs leaue to distinguish those things which in their owne nature are distinct: True it is that none of those *quae apud Bellarminum Baptismum comitantur*, are of their owne nature *impious*, neither are they of the essence of Baptisme: and therefore wee hold, that they which are Baptized, in the Church of Rome, are rightly Baptized. But if those *apud Bellarm.* are not *impious*, as you say, why call you them *Antichristian*? and if they be *Antichristian*, how are they not *impious*? we see your kind affectiō towards our Church: Our signing with the Crosse in Baptisme is *Antichristian*, as you

call it in the 14. Section, and yet these Popish additions, that defile the Sacrament are not impious.

Your argutation, that it must be either, *in Baptismo, extra Baptismum, aut nullibi*, is answered in a word. It is *in Baptismo*, that is, *in administratione Baptismi*, & not *in essentia Baptismi*. It is in Baptisme as an outward decent Ceremony, and ornament of the action, not as an inward part or substance of the Sacrament.

Treatise. Section. 12.

3. Obiection.

The signe of the Crosse is very auntient.

Treatisers answer to our 3. obiection.

So are many popish traditions, and if on that ground, we are to retaine it, why doe we not giue the Baptized, *lactis et mellis concordia*? why doe we not bring offerings for the dead? for Tertullian the first of the Fathers that euer mentioned the Crosse, doth establish these, & the signe of the Crosse, by one, and the selfe same warranty. Besides if upon the Fathers tradition wee use the Crosse, then must we receiue, and use it, as they haue deliuered it unto vs, that is, with opinion of vertue, & efficacy, not only in the Act of blessing our selues, and in the expelling of Diuells, but euen in the consecration of the blessed Sacraments: For the first Tertullian is witnes. *Ad omnē progressum, ad omnem promotum, ad omnem aditum, atq; exitum, ad vestitum et calceatum, frontem crucis signaculo terimus*: For chasing of Diuells, Hierome counselleth Demet. vir. *to use the Crosse*: *et crebo inquit signaculo crucis munias frontem tuam, ne exterminator Ægypti in te locum reperiat*: Lactantius de hoc signo scribens, ait Christi sectatores, inquinatos spiritus signo passionis excludere: Chrysostom in Psalm: 109. *Crux inquit mu-*

nic

De coron. willis.

Lib. 2. 20. epist.
ad Demetr.

Lib. 4. cap. 17.

nit mentem, ea dæmones vlc. scitur, ea tollit morbos animæ. *But these superstitions are small in regard of that efficacy, which in the Sacraments, antiquity ascribed unto Cyprian. de the Crosse: For Cyprian (being the auntientest, that mak- position. eth mention of the Crosse in Baptisme) speaketh of it. cu- ius virtus omnia peragit Sacramenta, sine quo signo nihil est sanctum, neq; aliqua consecratio meretur effectū;* And againe: Quicumq; sunt Sacramentorum ministri, qualescunq; sunt manus quæ vel mergunt accedentes ad Baptismum, vel vngunt, qualescunq; pectus, de quo sacra exeunt verba, operationis autoritas in figura crucis omnibus Sacramentis largitur effectum: August. in Ioh. tract: 118. Quod signum inquit nisi adhibeatur siue frōtibz credentium, siue ipsi aquæ, qua regenerantur, siue oleo quo Chrismate inungūtur, siue sacrificio quo aluntur, nihil eorum ritè perficitur: *It were superfluous to rehearse the rest.*

*Replie to the Treatisers answer to our
third Obiection.*

I looked in this place, that you would rather haue proved, the *noveltie* of this Ceremony, and that it is no ancienter then of some 600. yeares standing (as you please to iest before) then so easily yeeld, that it is *very ancient*, as here you doe: For you doe not deny the *antiquitie*, that which was objected, but imply, That *antiquity* is no cause *sufficient* why wee should vse it, because, say you, to are many other *Popish traditions*.

Your answer containeth these two branches.

1 If *antiquitie* be a cause, why we should retaine it, why should we not retaine other Ceremonies also, *as ancient* as this?

2 If vpon the *Fathers tradition* wee vse the Crosse,

why then doe we not vse it with opinion 'of *vertue & efficacy*, as they haue delivered it?

Vnto this your answer you add by way of Corollary that though it be *ancient*, yet *antiquity* could neuer free it frō *sin, & superstitiō*: whervpō you make two obseruations.

1 How *dāgerous* a thing it is to bring in any *humane invention* into the service of God.

2 How it may iustly be reputed *Popish & Antichristian*, though it were before those times wherein *Papery and Antichrist* were hatched.

First: we doe not thinke, that *Antiquity alone* without *reason and truth*, is cause *sufficient*, why wee shoulde retaine a Ceremony: Yet it may giue vs good cause, to examine the reasons, that moved the fathers to vse it, and not without iust cause rashly to abrogate and disanull it. Now because our Church by examining those reasons, that caused the Fathers to intitute, & vse this Ceremony of the Crosse in Baptisme, hath founde, that as it vvas then, so it may be stil a Ceremony of *decencie*, and *profitable admonition* in the Church: shee hath therefore according to that *liberty*, which in matter of *Ceremonie*, is permitted to every *seuerall Church*, retained this, & abrogated some other, which in her iudgmēt, seemed both more burdensome, & lesse profitable. These *reasons* cōcurring with *antiquity*, adde the greater weight vnto it, as on the other side, it addeth also vnto them; & *all of the together* yeeld cause *very sufficient*, why *some ancient Ceremonies* rather be retained, then *other some*. And therefore to your *first question*, why doe we not vse other *ancient Ceremonies* as well as this; I answer, Because our Church thought them not so *necessary*, nor *convenient*. Shee might, no doubt, haue still retained them, if shee would

would: For J willingly submit my weaker iudgement to that most graue, and learned iudgment of M^r. Bucer: *De ceteris signis, quæ in sacris adhibita sunt à veteribus, vel hodie adhibentur à multis, ut sunt ignis ad exorcismos, & catechismos, & alba vestis Baptizatorum, sacer panis qui dabatur Catechumenis, & pleraq; alia sic sentio: Si quæ Ecclesie essent, quæ puram Christi tenerent doctrinam, et sinceram seruarent disciplinam, hisq; signis uterentur simpliciter, et pure, absq; omni superstitione, vel leuitate, precise ad pias admonitiones, easq; probe omnibus intellectas, eas Ecclesias non possum equidem, propter signorum solum usum condemnare.* Bucer in 4. ep. ad Ephes.

Your two examples of *Lactis et mellis concordia*, and *offerings for the dead*, are auncient Ceremonies indeed, & in those times, had, no doubt, their very good & profitable vſe: as of the former *Tertullian* testifieth *lib. de coron. mil. cap. 3.* and of the latter, both *M^r. Beza*, & *Peter Martyr*, as is recorded before. & therefore though *Tertullian* doth establish these, & the signe of the Crosse, with the same warrantie of tradition, or Ecclesiasticall constitution, yet our Church counteth them not so necessary, nor so fitt for these latter times. Beza de notis Eccles. P. Martyr in c. 7 Iudicium.

The second braunch of your answer is: *If vpon the Fathers tradition, we vse the Crosse, then must we receiue, and vse it, as they haue deliuered it vnto vs, that is with opinion of vertue and efficacy:* Supposing that this opinion of vertue & efficacy (wherof we shall say more afterwards) was euill in the *Fathers*, yet there is no realſo, why we hauing free liberty to make our choice, should be bound to take their euill things with their good, as hath bin shewed before out of S^t. *Hierome*: For he that gaue vs the free commission of *omnia probate*, restrained vs

only to good things in our choice: *quod bonum est tenere.*

But my affection (willing I confesse in nothing rashly to accuse the Auntients) leadeth me rather to thinke, that euē this opiniō of vertue & efficacy that you speake of, was no euill thing in them, For though they vsed the consignation of the Crosse, in those actions, that you mentiō a litle after, yet they yeelded no opiniō of vertue and efficacy, to that signe, but to the *Crosse, & passion of Christ*, wherof that signe was an outward token and resemblance: And this I hope to make apparant to the indifferent reader, in every particular of your accusation.

First therefore you accuse them for ascribing *virtue & efficacy*, to the signe of the Crosse in the *Act of blessing* themselues, in common conversation: & this you proue out of *Tertullians Ad omnem progressum atq; promotum, &c.* But what if they by this act of *signing* theselues with the signe of the Crosse, did not intend *blessing* of themselues, as you tearme it, but *remembrance* of Christes benefits performed for them on the Crosse? For so S. *Cyrrill* answereth *Julian the Apostate*, when hee had called the Christians, *miseros. quibus cura esset semper, & domos & frontes, signo pretiosa crucis signare. Hec omnia* (saith hee) meaning the benefits of Christis passiō which he had recited before) *recordari nos facit salutare lignum, & suadet, ut cogiteremus, quod, sicut dicit diuinus Paulus, vnus pro omnibus mortuus est ut viuentes non vltra sibiipsis viuāt sed ei qui pro ipsis mortuus est, & resurrexit.* And a litle after, *pretiosi ligni crucem facimus in memoriā omnis boni & omnis virtutis.* What if they ascribed not this vvhich you call *blessing*, to the signe of the Crosse, but to *Christis passion*, represented and remembered vnto them by this signe? for so M. *Perkins* teacheth you to thinke of them.

Crux

*Cyrrill. Alexand
contr. Iulianum
lib 6. tom 3.*

1. Cor. 5. 15.

Crux (apud veteres) non significat ipsum signū crucis, sed per Metonymiam passionem crucifixi. To which purpose he expoundeth *Constantines* in *terto vix. id est, Deo*, *non* signo: and citeth an authoritie of *Chrysostome*, *Crucem non simpliciter digito in corpore, sed magna profecto fide in mente formare oportet.* And afterwards concludeth all that hee had saide before, with this most excellent rule, how the Fathers are to be vnderstood, when they attribute any thing to this signe: *Omnia dicta Patrum*, (saith he) *ubi crucē, spem, redemptionem, ac salutē esse volunt, intelligenda esse relatiue, vt referantur ad passionem Christi, vcl ad ipsum crucifixum, signo crucis representatum*: So that not only the Fathers reposed no such vertue and efficacy in the signe, but also, if any man should vse it now, (which yet I will not commend vnto any man, by reason of the scandall it may bring with it) I hold that iudgement of *Hemingius* very sound, *Qui mane surgens, et vespere cubitum vadens, signat se cruce, in signum militia Christiana, non est culpandus, modo absit superstitio.*

Perkins de mon. prob. cap. de signo crucis.

Chrysost. in Mat. Hem. 55.

Hemin. in 1. ep. Ioan. cap. 5.

Secodly you accuse them for ascribing vertue and efficacy to the signe of the Crosse, in expelling and chafing away of *Demils*, for proofe whereof, you cite *Hierome ad Demetriadem. Lactant. lib. 4. cap. 17.* and *Chrysostome in Psal. 109.* All these authorities I easily grant to be true, and a number such like, in the writings of the fathers: and yet I deny that in those speeches, they ascribe any opiniō of vertue or efficacy to the sign of the Crosse. This is not mine owne opinion only, but I learne it of that excellent diuine *Hier. Zanchius*. I doubt not, saith he but that sometimes Satan was driven away indeede at the signe of the Crosse, as *Augustine* reporteth many miracles to haue

Zanchi. de redemptione. lib. 6. p. 366

Hier. Zanch. de redemptione. lib. 6. pag. 366.

haue bin done with that signe, and the Devil also, to haue bin chased: De ciuitate Deil. lib. 22. cap. 8. *Verū non propter vim signi, sed propter virtutem fidei, in Christum crucifixum, quā prae diti erant, et sunt fideles. in fugam vertebatur, atq; vertitur Diabolus.* Goulartius, speaketh to the like effect: *Signum illud (crucis) ad passionem et sanguinem Christi pertinere Cyprianus testatur, Quamuis ergo veteres Christiani externo signo crucis vsi sunt, id tamen fuit sine superstitione: et doctrina de Christi merito ab errore, qui postea irrepit, pios seruauit immunes,* Cyprian himselfe speaketh so fully to this purpose, as any man that marketh his words cannot conceiue so grossly of the

Goulartius in Cyprian. ad Demetrium. cap. 19.

Cyprian. de passion. Christi. cap. 11.

Ancients: His words be thele, *Iam videt Hebraeus, et quicumq; de seruitute Aegyptia adre promissa patria libertatē anhelat, quod sanguis Christi efficacius, quam sanguis agni illius, quem in Aegypto Israel immolauit, contrarias abigat potestates: cuius hodiē tanta est auctoritas, & potestas, ut non solum Israelitica liminamuniat, sed etiam ab ijs qui Israeliticē non vivunt, solum Sacramenti signū repellat Dæmonia, & ubicunq; conspecta fuerit, terribilis sit sacri nominis virtus, & sanguinis nota.* This testimony I haue rehearsed at large, because it most excellently delivereth vnto vs, as wel his own opiniō, as the opiniō of al the Ancients, touching this signe. And yet if you desire a plainer testimony, hear *M. Perkins*, who in most expresse & significant tearmes vtterly acquitteth thē of your vn-

Perkins demon prob. cap. de figuris crucis.

iust accusation. *Veteres (saith he) se cruce cōtra Dæmones munierunt, non quod externo signo crucis tantam vim & efficaciam adscripserint, sed hac solenni ceremonia suam fiduciam in crucem, id est, mortem Christi, apud alios testari, et quodam quasi monitorio fidē excitare voluerunt, quæ omnia mala depellit:* And because you shall not haue the

vle

vse of this Ceremony without a reason, *Zanchius* telleth you why it pleased God to shewe such power at the making of this signe, *ut illos in sincera fide confirmaret, qui primam ad Christi veniebant religionem.* Zanch. loco supra citato.

Thirdly you accuse them for ascribing *vertue and efficacy*, to the signe of the Crosse, in consecration of the blessed Sacraments, And this you aggrauat with Tragick words, For these *superstitions*, say you, are small in regard of that *efficacy*, which in the Sacraments *Antiquity* ascribed vnto the Crosse: and this point you proue out of *S^t. Cyprian de Bapt. & passione Christi.* & *S^t. Aug. 118. tract: vpon S^t. Iohn.* All these authorities I willingly acknowledg: But withal I must giue you to vnderstand, that you cite your first authority out of *S^t. Cyprian, mala fide.* For there, by the Crosse he meaneth Christs passio, wherein the Apostle *S^t. Paule* boasteth: and your second partially and to your owne aduantage, as partly hath bin told you before: For after these words: *Operationis autoritas in figura crucis, omnibus Sacramentis largitur effectum,* you should haue added that which immediately followed, *Et cuncta peragit nomen, quod omnibus nominibus eminet, & Sacramentorum Vicarijs inuocatum,* & then the latter part of the Sentence would haue cleared the former, from that most wrongful imputatio that you lay vpon it. *S^t. Aug.* in that place sheweth, not how the Crosse sanctifieth, but how it signifieth.

It is a very strong and strang concept of yours that could induce you to thinke, that the Auncient Fathers were so simple, as to ascribe any *efficacy* of consecration of the Sacraments, vnto the *signe of the Crosse*, you cannot be ignorant, that the name or word of *consecration*, is an *Ecclesiastica* word, of frequent vse in the matter of Sacraments, called sometimes *Sanctification* as in *Cypri-*

Quando per crucem Christi quam ficerunt mali, in celebratione sacramentorum, eius bonum nobis omne signatur, & so
Maist Perkins
himselfe expounds it.
demon. prob. ca. de signo crucis.

1. Cor. 10. 16.

an, and diuers others, sometimes ἐννοησις *Inuocation* as in S^r. *Basill*, and *Theodoret*, sometimes εὐλογία, *Benediction*, as *Mat. 26:26*: *Mark. 14.22*. *1. Cor. 10. 16*. sometimes εὐχαριστία, *Thanksgiuing* as *Luk. 22. 19. 1. Cor. 11. 24*. but most ordinarily *consecration* in the writings of the Fathers. Neither can you be ignorant, that S. *Paule* calleth the cuppe. τὸ ποτήριον τὸ εὐλογίας ὃ εὐλογούμεν. *The cuppe of blessing, which we blesse*, referring this blessing not vnto God, but vnto the cupp: inasmuch as *Occumenius* expoundeth the *Apostle*, as if he had said thus: τὸ εὐλογεῖν κατὰ σκευάζομεν. *the cup of blessing which we blesse*, that is which we prepare with praise and thanksgiuing. It is euident therefore, that the name of *consecration*, when we speak of the Sacraments, is no such name as we should be afraid of, hauing so good warrant for it: especially in the Scriptures. The thing that is signified by the name, would likewise be considered, that therby we may also iudge, whether the *Auntients* be iustly taxed by the *Treatiser*. The thing therefore signified by this name, was nothing else among the *Auntients*, but a *sequestration* of the *Elements*, from their common use, and a *sanctifying* of them, by *praier*, & *inuocation*, and *thanksgiuing* vnto God, to that holy use which was proper to the Sacraments: as of the *water* in Baptisme that it might be *sanctified*, to the mysticall washing away of sins: of the *bread and wine* in the *Lords supper*, that it might be prepared & *sanctified* to the spiritual eating of Christs body, and drinking of his blood. *Noster calix et panis*, saith S^r. *Augustine*. certa consecratione mysticus fit nobis, non nascitur: proinde, quod non ita fit, quamuis sit panis, et calix, adiumentum est refectiōis, non Sacramentum religionis. Thus far the *Auntient* Fathers are free frō blame, for

Aug. cons. Faust
Manich. li. 20.
cap. 13. Tom. 6.

for even we also in our Church doe the same thing: For we likewise do by praier and invocation *sanctifie the Elements*. (which are otherwise of their *owne nature ordained for common use*;) that they may serue for *holy uses*: and that those things, which were before *necessary helps*, for the use of life, and clensing of our bodies, may nowe become *effectuall signes of regeneration*, and of the body and bloud of Christ, for the nourishing of our souls. Neither doe we now in our Church abhorre the name of *consecration*, nor think the thing to noe purpose, but ascribe vnto it a certaine effect of *change*, that it worketh in the *Elements*, not of their *substance*, into an other, nor of their *naturall qualities*, (as the *Papists* conceiue their *Magickall consecration*) to effect *Transubstantiation*, but of their use, and seruice only; that those things which were for common use before, are now dedicated and appropriated to these *holy uses*.

Againe a man that truly esteemeth, that the Fathers ascribe no vertue nor efficacy to the sacraments themselves; wil easily free them from this imputation, of ascribing vertue and efficacy to the signe of the Crosse in Consecration. For how can any man imagine: that they which attribute the vertue and efficacy of consecrating the Elements to the signe of the Crosse, should not much more ascribe vnto the Elements so consecrated, some efficacy and vertue of themselves? Now that they ascribed no such power vnto the Sacraments themselves, nor had any conceit of *grace* to be conferred by the *opus operatum* of the Sacraments, as the schoolmē afterward conceived, we haue most full and certaine assurance out of their owne testimonies. S. Hierome saith. *Qui plena fide non accipiunt Baptisma, non spiritum sanctum, sed*

aquam percipiunt. S. Ambrose likewise to the same purpose, *spiritus munus est, gratiam implere mysterij. S. Augustine* is plentiful in this argument. *Sacramenta, nō quia sumuntur, sed quia creduntur, sanctificant.* And againe, *in fidelibus & Electis Sacramenta hoc verē efficiunt, quod figurant.* And againe, *Visibilis sacramenti forma, à ministro datur, ipse autem Christus invisibilem dat gratiam.*

August. quest.
ex nouo Test.
59.

De unit. Chris-
tiani cap. 3.

And in another place, *Aqua cernitur, sed qui non videtur spiritus operatur. Vnde tanta vis aqua, ut corpus tangat, & cor abluit, nisi faciente verbo, non quia dicitur, sed quia creditur?* And S^t. Cyprian most plainely of all. *Effectum sanctificationis Elementis, non propria eorum natura prabet, sed virtus divina potentiùs operatur, ut adsit veritas signo, & spiritus sacramento: atq; ex ipsis rerum efficientijs dignitas gratie patefiat, & interiori homini innotescat.*

Yea say you, all this were well enough, but herein the Fathers are to be blamed, because in consecration, they vsed the signe of the Crosse, and ascribed this consecration, & sanctifying of the Elements vnto that signe. They vsed the signe of the Crosse therein indeede, and thence are these speeches of theirs which you alleadged. But they ascribed not this consecration, and hallowing to the signe of the Crosse, but vnto Christes death, whereof the Lords Supper is a remembrance. *Doeth this in remembrance of me: And Baptisme a similitude or representation, vvee that are Baptized into Christ Iesus, are Baptized into his death, and are buried with him by Baptisme into his death, &c.* And therefore in these Sacraments of Christs death, they made the signe of the Crosse, wheron he died, to signifie that it was his death, that gaue efficacie and vertue to these Sacraments. Also they ascribed this efficacie and power, not vnto the signe of the Crosse, but vnto the words of consecration, or if you wil rather so call them, of Christes.

11. Cor. 11. 24.

Rom. 6. 3. 4.

Christ's institution according to that of *S. Augustine*. *Accedat verbum ad elementum, & fit Sacramentum*. And because the words of *Christ's institution* refer vs alwaies to his death, therefore they made in the pronouncing of the, the *signe* of the Crosse, wheron he died. Hence it is, that though they vsed the *signe* of the Crosse in *consecration*, yet they attributed not the *vertue* of consecration vnto it, but vnto *Christ* and his *institution*. And therefore *S^r. Cyprian*, whereloeuer he mentioneth the one, doeth alwaies ioine the other with it: As, *in passione crucis, et signo virtus omnis est, & potestas*; & in the examples before rehearsed, with *Figura crucis*, he ioineth *peragit nomē invocatum*, and with *signum* repellat *demonia*, hee ioineth, *sacri nominis virtus, & sanguinis nota*. The like doth *S. Aug.* *Omnia quaecumq; sanctificantur hoc signo dominica crucis cum invocatione Christi nominis consecrantur*.

Cyp. testim. ad Quirin. lib. 2. cap. 22.

Aug. serm 181. de Temp. vide & serm. 19. de Sanctis.

The distinction that you make between *Tert.* & *Cyp.* that *Tert.* should bee the first of the Fathers that ever mentioned the Crosse, & *Cyprian* the ancientest; that maketh mention of the Crosse in Baptisme, is a very vaine & frivolous distinction. For (to keepe my selfe within the compasse of those Ancients that I haue before cited,) both *Iustin Martyr*, before *Tertullia*, mentioneth the Crosse: & *Tertullian* himselfe, as also *Origen*, which were before *Cyprian*, make mentiō of the Crosse in Baptisme, as before I haue declared. It were superfluous, say you, to rehearse the rest, & these too, except you rehearsed the to better purpose.

Treatise. 13. Sect.

But hereby it is evident, that the religious use of the Crosse, was even at the first sinfull, and superstitious, neither can it be shewed, that it was ever vsed by the Fathers: Religionis ergo sine admixta superstitione, and this in-

ventio did no sooner creepe into the Sacramēt, but it drew vnto it selfe such superstitious conceit of efficacie & necessity, that without it, the meanes which God appointed for the consecration of the Elements, seemed overweake, yea unavaileable, according as some^a amongst vs, account not their children lawfully Baptized, yea, will haue the rebaptized, if the Crosse haue bin omitted.

^a Lately in Surrey a child rebaptized, because, the Crosse was omitted.

Answer.

This is that which you adde, by way of *Corollary*, to your answer, importing thus much in effect, as I conceiue: That though the *signe* of the Crosse be very *ancient*, yet *antiquity* could not free it from *sin*, and *superstition*: we doe not alleadge the *antiquity* of the Crosse, as an argument to free it from *sin* and *superstition*, which we thinke in *our vse*, and in the *vse* of the *Ancients*, it is not infected with. But we alleadge it, as an argument why it should not be rashly changed, and taken away, as you would haue it, both because it was ordained vpon *good reason*, and advise at the *first*, and hath bin vsed ever since, with no *small profit* to the Church. As for the *evidence* you talke of, it doth not yet appeare, the *vse* of it in actions of *religion*, without opinion of *vertue* and *efficacie*, was ever free from *sin* & *superstition*. But to this your accusation, I shal neede to speake nothing in this place, because I haue answered it before against you, & against your grand Master T. C. Especially seeing here you bring no matter, but repeat your former equivocation of religious vse, and repose vnto vs your olde Crambe of *Religionis ergo*, so often recodet.

Your second obiection, *that this inuention did no sooner creepe into the Sacrament, but it drew vnto it selfe such superstitious conceit, of efficacy &c.* Is likewise answered

red in the last section, the conceite of *superstitious necessity*, that, you say, *it drew vnto it, that without &c.* is the fault of the *persons* that so conceiued of it, & not of the *signe* it selfe: For this *signe* of the Crosse *perinde est*, as *q. is qui vitur, bene utentibus bonum est, male utentibus malū est*. And therefore the best way to reforme this misconceite, is to instruct them aright, that doe thus superstitiously conceiue of it, A far better way then vtterly to abolish it, as may appeare euen by your *owne example* of a *childe* lately rebaptized in *Surrey*, because the *Crosse* was omitted: For if this be true, it is manifest, that the taking of the vse of the *Crosse* cleane away, would *scādalize* & alienate more mens minds frō our church, then the retaining of it still can doe; for seeing that they that will take offence at the *remouing* of it, are the weaker: and you that knowe what belongeth to matters of such indifferency are the stronger, it is much more agreeable to the rule of Christian charity, that you in the spirit of mildnesse should beare with their infirmities, by *allowing* the lawfully established vse therof, thē they should haue any cause of offence given vnto them, by the *utter abrogating* and remouing of it. If any man among vs, vppon such conceite of *necessity* of this *signe*, as you intimate, haue caused his Child to be rebaptized, because the Crosse was omitted, Charity bids me not to doubt, but that the wisdom, & authority of our chiefe *Gouernours*, haue had an eie vnto it, & the Minister that gaue the offence, hath bin hartely sorry for his omission: For, *Take heed*, saith the Apostle, in another thing indifferent, *least by any means this liberty of yours, be an occasiō* 1. Cor. 8. 9. *of falling to them that are weake*. But now we will consider your two obsetuations.

Treatise. 14. Sect.

Out of which may be observed, first howe dangerous a thing it is to bring in any humane invention, into the service of God, sith in the very pure age of the Church, it was punished with such a spirituall curse of horrible superstition. Secondly, though at this time Popery was not hatched, yet the mystery of iniquity was then a working, and the beginning, as it were, of the whorish fornication was found, even in the Fathers times, so that as worshipping of Angels in Paules time, prayers, and oblations for the dead, in Tertullians time, be rightly counted Popish and Antichristian, though as yet that monster was not borne, so this and other ceremonies ratified by the Popish Canons & constitutions may well bee taken for Popish and Antichristian, even in the Fathers times, seeing they then made a waie for the Beast, and since haue receiued farther impiety, & authority from him. Wherefore, to conclude, as I say exhorteth Gods people, to keepe themselves frō the rites & pollutions of the Heathen, saying, depart, depart yee, goe out from them, and touch no vncleane thing: so the spirit in the same manner, chargeth the Church not to meddle with the corruptions of Antichristian Babilon, but goe out of her my people, saith he, that you may not bee partaker of her sinnes, and that yee receiue not of her plagues. The feare of which curse doth keepe vs from all the superstitions, and idolatrous ceremonies of that whorish Synagogue.

Answer.

Touching your first obseruation, How dangerous a thing it is, &c. Though I haue said sufficiently before, yet this one word I adde more by way of remembrance: That if humane invention be brought into the Church, either with a purpose to attract any thing from the in-

sti-

Institution of God, or to equal them to Gods ordinance, or to obscure & darken Christs institution, or to impose a yoke or burden vpon mens consciences, or with opinion either of efficacy or necessity, or with mixture of impiety and superstition, or that they should be esteemed any otherwise of, then of things indifferent: then we confesse, that it is indeed a thing very dangerous to bring any humane invention into the seruice of God: and that the curse of God wil alwaies accompany such inventions. But on the contrary side, if they be brought into the Church, only as Ceremonies, to attend Gods institution, as ornaments for decency, order, edification, and admonition, or if the causes, ends, and vses, for which they were first instituted, remaine still: (all which circumstances concur, in our vse of the Croſſe in Baptiſme,) then we see no reason, why they may not lawfully be vsed in Gods seruice; and hould them not only free from Gods curse, but also accompanied with his blessing, so long as they are retained and obserued with these limitations:

Touching your second obseruation, *how a thing may be iustly reputed Popish & Antichristian, though it were before that monster of Popery and Antichrist were hatched.* I must needs say, you bring vs to a pretty & strange speculation, and deriue the pedigree of *Popish Antichristianisme* farther, then he that began the *Troia* war *gemino ab ovo*: for you fetch it from before the egge, & the Hen too, and make me to remember that vaunt of the *Arcadians*, that boasted they were before the *Moone*.

That a Ceremony, that is opposite vnto the *Doctrine & Gospell of Christ*, (as you wrongfully suppose this to be) may be *Antichristian*, before Popery, I doe not denie, for, *Euen now, saith Saint Iohn of his times, there are ma-* 1. Ioh. 2. 18.

2. Thess. 2.

*ny Antichristes: The mystery of iniquity began to worke berimes; It wrought in Simon Magus, and his followers, while Christ was yet aliue; It wrought in Elimas the Sorcerer, in the false Apostles, and in the Nicholaitans, in Menander, Ebion, and Cerinthus, euen in the Apostls times; All these were Antichrists: And any here sye either in doctrine or Ceremony, that they held against the truth & word of Christ was Antichristiā. But that a thing should be Popish and Antichristian, and that before Popery was hatched, is in my vnderstanding as if you should haue said, The chicken was a bird before the Hen peeped out of the shell. As in other things, so in Antichristianisme, *Tēpora sunt distinguenda*: or else we shal make a confusion of all things, and so speake of heresies, as if all heresies were but one heresie: and those which St. Iohn calleth many Antichrists, were but one Antichrist, called κατ' ἐξοχὴν ὁ ἀντίχριστος, that Antichrist whom you conceiue the Papacy to be.*

Coll. 2. 18.

You proue this, *a simili*, as worshipping of Angels in S. Paules time, &c. Antichristian they might bee rightly counted, because they were against the truth, and doctrine of Christ, Popish they could not, because neither was Popery yet heard of, nor had the Papacy yet imbraced those superstitions.

Again, that a thing should be Popish or Antichristiā, is not in the thing, but in the minds of them that make it Popish and Antichristian. For this you haue bin oftē told, that no ceremony can be Popish & Antichristian of it selfe:

Bucer de sacris
vest. ad Hopp.

Ritum aliquem Aaronicum esse vel Antichristianum, in nullis heret Dei creaturis, in nulla veste, in nulla figura, in nullo colore, aut ullo Dei opere, sed in animo & professione, bonis Dei creaturis, ad impias significationes abutentium.

Things

Things are good,saith he farther, not only in their *natural effects*,as bread in the effect of feeding, & strengthening of the body: wine,in the effect of drinking & heating:but also in their *diuers significations & admonitions*: *Quæ scriptura docet, diabolo, vel malis hominibus, eã fac- tam esse potestatem, ut abusu suo ullam queant Dei crea- turam, et bonam etiam significando et admonendo, per se malam facere et impiam?* wherefore nothing can be said to belong to the Priesthood of *Aron*, but that which is vsed to that *superstition*,as if it were *necessary and profit- able* of it selfe to *saluation*,euen now after Christ is re- ueled; or wherby some occasion,to imbrace or retaine that superstition,or to trouble the concord of Brethrẽ, may be ministred: So likewise no rite can be called *Anti- christian*,but that, wherby some *profession, and commun- ication with Antichrist* may be shewed, or may serue to that *profession or communication*. And a litle after he hath these words,very pertinent and effectually to this purpose:*Eam enim libertatem &c.* For if any man wil say that this liberty(of Ceremonies) may be permitted to no Church of Christ, he must needes yeeld to one or o- ther of these inconueniences,Ether that nothing is grã- ted to the Churches touching the Lords supper,but that wheteof they haue *the expresse commandement of Christ*, and then al the Churches must be condemned of wick- ed boldnes and presumtiõ &c. Or that there are not any Churches,which the Lord doth so farre free from al sus- pition and abuse of his good creatures,that al the good creatures of God are pure(through true faith in his nãe) to them that are pure,yea euen in their signification; which who soeuer shall say, he therein must also denie, Christ to be that Lord,which he hath promised him- selfe

selfe to be to al men, that is, their deliuerer from al vn-
cleannes: Or that wicked men by their abuse can so pol-
lute the creatures of God, which are good of themselus,
as they can *serue no godly man to a godly vse*: which is
manifestly against the testimony of the holy Ghost: *Rō:*
14. 14. 1. Cor. 8. 4. et 9. 20. 1 Tim. 4. 4. Or certainly that
it is not lawfull for Christians, *to dispose of al things*, for
admonition of their Creator and ours, of his *benefits to-*
wards vs, and of our *duties* towards him: which is repug-
nant to that, that the holy Ghost teacheth every where,
concerning the knowledg and worship of God in al his
works, and doing al things in *the name of our Lord Iesus*
Christ, to the glory of the father.

This testimony of M^r. Bucer I haue therefore repea-
red at large, because therein two things very effectual to
this present questiō are delivered. *First*, that the church
hath *libertie* and power to *ordaine* thinges *indifferent* in
Gods service: And *secondly*, that *no abuse* of other men cā
so pollute the creatures of God, as that the *pollution*
should ever after *cleaue* to the *creatures*, as the Leprosie
of *Naaman* did vnto *Giezi*: but the corruptiō remaining
only in the *mindes* of them that did defile the creatures,
they become againe *pure*, to them that are *pure*, that is,
to the faithful. Whence it followeth necessarily, that no-
thing can be iustly reputed *Antichristian* vnto any, but
vnto them that vse it to *that end*, that Antichristian pro-
fession may be advanced by it, or with that *opiniō*, that
they that are Antichristian doe ascribe vnto it: whervpō
it must as necessarily ensue, that seeing we in the *Church*
of England, do not vse the *signe* of the Crosse in Baptism,
to *advance the professiō of Antichrist*, nor with those *o-*
pinions that *Popish Antichristes* doe ascribe vnto it, ther-
fore

fore vnto vs it remaineth *pure and cleane*, & leaveth the *Popery* and *Antichristianisme*, that it had, sticking stil in the mindes and consciences of Popish Antichrists. The foundation therfore of your observation being thus shaken, we will now trie the iointes and sinewes of your argument, whereby you would conclude this Ceremonie to haue bin Antichritian in the *Ancients*, and therefore must bee also such in vs. Against the *Ancients* you argue thus.

That which was the beginning, as it were, of the whorish fornications, and made way for the beast, may well be takē for Popish and Antichristian.

But the abuses and opinion of vertue, and efficacy, that the Ancients had of the signe of the Crosse, were the beginnings of the whorish fornications, and made way for the beast. Ergo.

The abuses and opinion of efficacy and vertue, that the Ancients had of the signe of the Crosse, may well bee taken for Popish and Antichristian.

To the *Maior*. *That which was the beginning &c.* It is true in the, in whō it was the beginning of whorish fornications, and in whō it made way for the beast, as in *Simon Magus*, *Elimas*, the *Nicholaitans*, the *false Apostls*, and the *Heretiques*: al which, no doubt, gaue the beginnings to the whorish fornications, and made way to the beast. In the *holy fathers* that did not so, it cānot be iustly reputed *Popish*, or *Antichristian*, as hath bin declared in the last words before.

To the *Minor*. *But the abuses &c.* It is false: for the *Ancients* did not abuse it, neither had any opiniō of vertue and efficacy of it, as is shewed in the 12. sect: & therefore your cōclusiō toucheth none but the, that were for-

runners of Antichrist; It cannot touch the *Antient fathers*, that opposed themselves, to the first working of the *mystery* & resisted the *Heresies*, that made way to the Beast. Like vnto this is your reason that you make against our present vse.

That which hath since receiued farther impiety, and authority from the Antichrist, may iustly be taken for Popish & Antichristian now.

But the signe of the Crosse in Baptisme in the Church of England, hath since receiued farther impiety & authority from the Antichrist. Ergo

The signe of the Crosse in Baptisme in the Church of England, may iustly be taken for Popish and Antichristian now.

The *Maior* of this argument holdeth true as the *Maior* of the former did, that is, in them, in whome it hath receiued farther impiety, and authority frō Antichrist, In others in whome it hath not receiued farther impiety, it holdeth not.

The *Minor* is false, for in the Church of England the Popish abuses of the Crosse, haue receiued neither *farther impiety, nor authority*, but contrariwise are al removed; and the first *sincere vse* of the Antients is retained: For we vse this *signe* of the Crosse, in truth, to no other purpose, thē we vse the *name* or *worde* *Crosse*, that is, only for *signification* and *admonition*; and seeing there is no other difference betweene thē, but what the word soundeth vnto the eare, that the signe representeth vnto the eie, why should there be more fault founde with the one, thē with the other? or why should our vsing of more outward meanes, for helping our infirmities, in remembring Christs passion be misliked, Seeing in al other matters

ters, the more meanes we vse to helpe our weakenes, the better we reckon of the: *Ex quo nostre redemptionis pretium, in cruce pependit, illud ipsum crucis vocabulum antea ignominiosissimum, nobis Christianis factum est honorificentissimum.* If the word Crosse be so honourable, because our Saviour sometimes hunge vpon the Crosse, why should the signe of the same thing be so daungerous and pernicious? And therefore your conclusion no way hurte the Church of England, but only in the vniust calūniation, that it laieth vpon it, and in it vpon the Ancients whose reputation, and integrity, touching the Crosse, standing good (as for any thing you can say against it, it alwaies wil) it is not possible for you to fasten the *Popish* abuses, and whorish fornications of the *Romish Antichrist* vpon our Church.

Beza in defen.
& reprehens.
Sebast. Castellu

The exhortation, wherewith you conclude this your Treatise is good, in *Thesiv* unto al men, & even in this particular *Hypothesis* of the Crosse in Baptisme, to the that are intangled, & defiled with *Popish* conceits, & superstitions. But vnto vs, that are no waies partakers of those corruptions, you might very wel haue forborne it.

The feare of a curse, least being partakers of the *Romish Antichrists* sins, you should also receiue of her plagues, keeps you, you say, from his superstitious Idolatries: The feare of a curse, ought, no doubt, to be a great bridle to restraine all men from doing evil. But we invite you not to be partakers of the *Romish Antichrists* sinnes, but only of our society, in our innocent and harmlesse *Christian Ceremonies*. Wherin if you fear a curse, you fear where no cause of feare is. If you fear a curse indeed, as you pretend, you shall do wel to translate this feare of yours, frō the harmlesse vse of the Crosse, wherein either there is no danger

at all (as we are perswaded) or no certaine danger (which your selues cannot proue) vnto the most certaine & vndoubted danger of disobedience; whervnto, without al peradventure, there is due a fearfull and seuerer curse, as we are taught by the exampls of *Corah, Dathan, and Abiram* in the booke of God: To which purpose also the wise preacher, that sought to find out pleasant words, & an vpright writing, euen the words of truth, doth aduertise vs, namely to take heed to the mouth of the King, & to the word of the oath of God, that is, as the Geneua note doth well expound it, *obey the King, & keepe the oath, that thou hast made for the same cause. Ne perturbat e facie eius abito*: For this is *radix rebellionis*, saith M. Cartwright, *Si perturbat animo ferri se patiatur: unde fit, ut pleriq; a subiectione debita deficient, cum ira, indignatione, ambitione, lucri cupiditate, ab officio discedunt*; This is the roote of rebellion, if men will suffer themselues to be caried with discontentment, from the presence of the King: whence it cometh, that many men fall from due subiection, when they depart from their duty, either for anger, or indignation, or ambition, or desier of gaine.

The conclusion to the Treatise & his friends.

And thus far I haue attended the Treatisers discours, step by step & foot by foot, omitting, as I think, nothing that is *materiall*: and yeelding, as I hope, iust satisfaction to al them, that with peaceable minds, & vnpartiall affectiōs shall be pleased to weigh his arguments, & my answers in indifferent ballances: wherin if I haue done any thing that may content (though in the least degree) you to whom this answer is addressed, I shall thinke this labour of mine, wel bestowed: where vnto, as I was first moued by them, which had authority to command me,

so

ſo it was on my owne part moſt willingly vnderaken, with an ernest deſire to ad if poſſibly J might, ſome drop of water to the quenching of that flame of diſcontentment that thus rageth amōgſt vs: And J truſt, J may the rather hope, that ſome good hereby may be effected, in that J came into this worke, with a ſingle mind, & without aſe or affection to any particular man, that might be imagined to be the writer of this Treatiſe: of whom, J neither had, nor yet haue, ſo much as the leaſt ſinckling or ſuſpition. Only the matter and argument of this Treatiſe, drew on my pen: which (to ſpeake my iudgment & opiniō of it) ſeemed vnto me ſo warily ſet down, as that it might both ſtumble a weake and vnſetled reader: and alſo add obſtinacy, & ſtiffnes, to minds already poſſeſſed with loue, and liking of that opinion; though it haue neither ſtrength of argument, nor power of perſuaſion, to winn any man vnto that conceite, that either had iudgment to deſcerne the manifold fallacies and captions therein vſed, or ſtood before contrarily affected.

That which J would now lay is, to deſier the Treatiſer and his friends, that they would firſt reforme themſelues, and remoue this ſtumbling block, which themſelues, and not our Church hath laid before them, out of their owne waies. If it be, as they are wont to ſay, againſt their conſciences, thē to reforme the error of their owne conſciences, which no doubt, they may doe, by informing their conſciences aright, and laying true *Science* as the ſureſt foundation of their conſciences; If otherwiſe it be but only feare, leaſt they may ſeeme by yeelding to haue ouer ſcene them ſelues, and hauing ſōrimes preached againſt this Ceremony, may be accuſed of lenity & inconstancy in their doctrine, and ſo conſequently bring

on some discredit, vnto their Ministry. let the know, that al these are but *humane respects*, and can no way be alledged, as iust causes, why they should break brotherly amity and concord, and make a rent, and dissension in the Church of God: Neither can these outward respects giue any iust excuse, to disobedience, & opposition, against the *Magistrat, & laws established*: which being of things indifferent, made for preferuation of order & decency in the Church, *bind their consciences*: and that resistance, that is made against them, is made against the *ordinance of God*.

Secondly, I doe very hartily desire them to consider howe great a *mischiefe* they haue brought vpon our Church: what breach of Christian *charity* among our selues, which being al of one houlhold, should bee all of one minde; and what reioycing and courage they haue given to our common enemy, *ὃς ἔστιν ὑποβίβρις ἀπειρῶτος ἀπειρῶτος δὲ παίδες*: How the *Papists* reioice to see this iar amongst vs: how *Poperie* dayly doth prevaile, and take strength, & hatt, by occasion of this breach. How much better were it, to turne these forces that are spent vpon our selues, against the commō aduersary? who (as lamentable experience hath taught vs) maketh this strife of ours, a fit occasion and instrument to overthrow our common faith. As lately did appeare most manifestly, when they endeavored to cloake their barbarous, and inhumane cruelty, with the colour of your *discōtētēt* against the state. Full of rage and malice is Satan now towards the last time of his hopes: he worketh every way, & laieth al his snares to deceiue the simple: in some by *pretensed zeale*: in some by *delusions* and false *impostures*: in some by *diuellish plots* and desperate designes: and generally in all sorts of men,
by

by heaping *disgraces* and contempt vpon the *reuerende* *Cleargie*, and Ministry of this Church. as if they were the only lets, that hindered the full strengthening and perfecting of his kingdome.

These things and many other grievous sins, & works of darknes, that blush not now to shew themselves in the open day, could not thus swarme amongst vs, as daylie they doe, if we all truely intended the same thing: if vvee could faithfully & vnfainedly give one another the right hand of fellowship, and seriously doe the Lords worke with one consent. My hartie desire therefore, & earnest request is, that you with vs, & we with you, would rightlie consider these things: and knowing that our *holy Ministry* in preaching of Christ crucified, is the most forcible waie, wherby it pleaseth God to weaken the strength & bodie of sin, give our selues wholie to that worke: that laying aside these questions of Ceremonies, that haue now a long time troubled our peace, your contentiō hēce forth may be against them, that differ front vs in the substance of our saving faith: That so God may give a blessing to our labours, and wee all with one mouth, and one minde may glorifie God the Father of our Lorde Iesus Christ.

F I N I S.



Tho Smyth
1705

12

